

Dr. K.B. KRISHNA

selected writings

VOLUME 4

Essays on Contemporary
Political Issues

Dr. K.B. KRISHNA

Birth Centenary Celebration Committee Publication

Dr. K.B.Krishna Selected Writings

Volume Four

Essays on Contemporary
Political Issues

BY

Dr. K. B. Krishna

M.A.,PH.D. (HARVARD)

Editorial Board

Edpuganti Nageswara Rao

C. Raghavachari

G. Koteswara Rao

C. Narasimha Rao, Editor

N. Anjaiah, Editor

Dr. K.B. KRISHNA

Birth Centenary Celebrations Committee Publication

Centre for Scientific Socialism

Acharya Nagarjuna University

Nagarjuna Nagar - 522 510

DR. K.B. KRISHNA

Selected Writings

VOLUME 4

Essays on Contemporary Political Issues.

First Edition :

K.B. Krishna Birth Centenary Celebrations Committee, 2007

Title Design :

A. Giridhar

Printed at :

New C.P.C.,

Guntur - 522 002

Price : Rs. 125/-

\$. 20

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	iv
Preface	vi
A Forgotten Intellectual of the South	vii
Kambhampati Satyanarayana	

ESSAYS ON CONTEMPORARY POLITICAL ISSUES

Revolutionary Upsurge in India	December 1932	1
Siman to Sankey, A Marxian Study of Imperialist		
Methods of a constitution for India	April 1933	17
The Great Betrayal		
A Marxian Interpretation of Nehru Constitution	April 1933	43
History of Communist Activities In India	Early Thirties	57
Students and Politics	October 1940	77
Sir Barnard pares, the Comintern and Stalin	June 1943	97
Marxism and Class Alliances	June 1943	115
The Law of Combined Development	Early Thirties	129
Social Psychological Gaurantees	Early Thirties	145

Acknowledgements

A Centenary Committee with renowned people from different walks of life in Andhra Pradesh was formed to commemorate the Birth Centenary of Dr. Katragadda Bala Krishna (1906-2006), a Marxist scholar 'par excellence' and one of the pioneers in the application of Marxist methodology to study the multifacets of Indian society. The editorial board of the steering committee intends to bring out selected writings of Dr. Krishna in five volumes.

The publication of these volumes would not have been possible but for the most generous help extended by the 'kith and kin' of Dr. K.B.Krishna and a host of philanthropists and educationists whose debt can't ever be repaid. It is, therefore, pertinent to appreciate their gesture of goodwill individually.

We owe a special debt of gratitude to prof. K.S.R.K. Prasad, a retired professor from IIT, Mumbai, and Sri Katragadda Seshagiri Rao, Chennai, who have extended financial and moral support to the project.

We thank Sri Katragadda Brahmaiah, Proprietor of Sri Lakshmi Press, Guntur and Sri Katragadda Lakshmi Narasimha Rao, Chairman Katragadda Foundation, who evinced keen interest in the project and extended financial support to publish the first volume.

Sri Alapati Bapanna, Proprietor of Kala Jyothy Press, Hyderabad was kind enough to take the responsibility of publishing the second volume. We thank him profusely.

Sri Paruchuri Hanumanta Rao of Pragathi Art Printers, Hyderabad and Kavuri Kutumba Rao, one of the prominent participants of anti-zamindari movement in the erstwhile Challapalli Estate, most graciously agreed to publish the third volume. We thank them for their kind help.

We are grateful to Gaddipati Koteswara Rao, proprietor of New C.P.C., Guntur for accepting to print the fourth and fifth volumes.

Our special thanks are due to the Staff of A.P. State Archives, Hyderabad for their cooperation in putting together the manuscripts of Dr. K.B.Krishna as available in the Archives.

Comments and suggestions are earnestly solicited for guidance in future publications. We take this opportunity to thank those who have supported indirectly or anonymously and extended their cooperation in this strenuous task of publishing the works of Dr. K.B.Krishna.

Centenary Committee would like to thank sri C. Radhakrishna Das, President, Social Sciences Trust for having gone through the final proofs meticulously.

Steering Committee

Dr K.B.Krishna Birth Centenary Celebrations Committee

Suravaram Sudhakar Reddy
C. Narasimha Rao
N. Anjaiah
G. Koteswara Rao

Edpuganti Nageswara Rao
C. Raghavachari
T. Lakshminarayana
Y. Venkateswara Rao

PREFACE

It is the earnest endeavour of the editorial board to classify the selected works of Dr. K.B.Krishna and bring them in five volumes.

Volume one : 1. Political and Social Thought of the Buddhist Writers. (1930) 2. Theories of Kingship in Ancient India (1932) 3. Studies in Hindu Materialism (1932).

Volume two : The Problem of Minorities, or The Communal Representation in India. (Ph.D. Dissertation - 1935 ; Published -1939)

Volume three : 1. Studies in Imperialism (1932), 2. Plan for Economic Development of India (1945) 3. Second World War and Industrialisation of India.

Volume four : Essays on Contemporary Political Issues.

Volume five : 1. Diderot (French Materialist Philosopher) 2. Origin and Growth of Modern Democratic Ideas in 17th Century England.

The Present Volume consists of nine essays written by Dr. K.B.Krishna over a period of one decade between 1932 and 1943 on different political issues which were confronting the then British India. Except one, i.e. 'Students and Politics', which was printed by Welcome Press, Guntur in 1940, remaining essays were not published so far. The Centenary committee is pleased to present these essays to the discerning readers for the first time. Foot notes are shifted to the end portion of each essay, if given. Besides this, the title of the seventh essay is changed from 'Marxism and Unity' to 'Marxism and Class Alliances'. Except these two changes, no other alterations are made in any essay/s.

Editorial Board

Edpuganti Nageswara Rao
C. Raghavachari
G. Koteswara Rao

C. Narasimha Rao, Editor
N. Anjaiah, Editor

A Forgotten Intellectual of the South

Kambhampati Satyanarayana

Dr. K.B. Krishna (Katragadda Bala Krishna), a brilliant scholar committed to social advancement, a valiant fighter against imperialism and a steadfast champion of the working class, died unknown, unhonoured and unwept in our country. The thirty-second death anniversary falls on December 22, 1980.

His book, *The problem of Minorities, or Communal Representation in India*, was acclaimed by the UNESCO around 1950 as one of the two best works published till then on the question of minorities. His *Theories of Kingship in Ancient India* is based on primary sources like the Ramayana, the Mahabharata, Manu Smriti, Aitareya Brahmana, Taittiriya Brahmana, Baudhyana Dharma Sutra, Vasishta Samhita, Satapatha Brahmana, Sukra Neeti, Kalidasa's Raghuvamsa, Kautilya's Arthasastra, etc.,. His Political and Social Thought of the Buddhist Writers is based on ancient classics like Vajra Suci, Sutralankara, Saundarananda Kavyam, Buddha Charita, Lalita Vistara, Aryasura's Jataka Mala, Buddha Ghosha's Parables, etc.

He studied Economics and Politics in Britain from 1921 to 1929. As a student and research scholar in the University of Harvard from 1929 to 1938, Dr. Krishna had free access to the translations of all the source materials mentioned above. He joined Harvard as student of Political Science, earning while learning. He delved deep into all the works pertaining to his subject, besides those on Economics, Sociology and Philosophy. He also studied Jurisprudence, Administrative Law, Comparative Public Law etc.

Krishna discovered that Marxism was the best tool for understanding the laws of social development. He strove to apply these laws to the rise and fall of empires, institutions and systems of society. It is in the light of this knowledge that he conducted researches on various subjects and produced valuable papers, such as those on Hindu materialism, Buddhist thought, Dravidian polity, Indian nationalism, India and the League of Nations, Factory Legislation in India, etc.

Krishna worked on the problem of minorities, or the Hindu-Muslim problem in India. Those essays, coupled with his further studies on Nationalism and Imperialism, developed into a thesis on communal

representation in India. It was submitted to Harvard University. "There is not one page in this book", says he, "which Rupert Emerson (his Professor K.S.) did not criticise. He is the most formidable critic of my work at Harvard, and I am very much indebted to him." But Emerson had to confront a veritable Titan. Krishna defended his thesis so brilliantly that the decision to award him the Ph D was unanimous. The hard-boiled imperialist, Emerson, had to bow his head.

Since then Krishna revised his thesis continuously, taking advantage of the additional material he could find at the India Office Library, London, the Colonial Office Library, the British Museum, the India League and other organisations. The book was finally published by George Allen and Unwin in January 1939. It is an outright indictment of the policy of divide and rule pursued by British imperialism in India.

A few days before the outbreak of World War II (September, 1939) Dr Krishna arrived in Madras and took part in the First Tamil Nadu Students Conference at Chidambaram. He was deeply involved in the student movement in the South. He addressed students gatherings, attacking British imperialism for thrusting the war on the Indian people. These speeches soon landed him in jail. Being accustomed to a comparatively free atmosphere, he was unaware of the ways of British imperialism in India. He was arrested in early 1941 and detained in the Vellor Central Jail under the Defence of India Rules.

This writer, together with about two hundred detenues brought from the four linguistic zones of Madras Presidency, had the opportunity of spending a year and a half with Dr. Krishna, exchanging ideas with him, listening to his talks and discussing problems with him. His outspokenness, earnestness and simplicity, coupled with his depth of vision, power of analysis and clarity of thought impressed all those who were close to him. In jail he adopted a novel method of teaching Capital, a method in which the teacher was also the taught. It was simple, the more intelligent among the students were divided into small groups of three each. Each group read together a particular section in a chapter; helping one another to understand the author's argument. Next, they sat with the teacher (Krishna) to seek his help to get difficult concepts clarified. Next, the group elected one among themselves to give an exposition of the section to the class as a whole. He fulfilled his task to the best of his capacity, the teacher sitting by his side. After he had completed the job, another member of the group answered questions, and a third supplemented or clarified one or two. This method meant training teachers from among the stu-

dents. Such classes were held once in two days, leaving one day for preparation.

When the Vellore detenu yard was busy in this process of teaching-cum-learning, Moscow Radio announced on June 21, 1941 that Hitler's forces had launched a massive attack on the Soviet Union along the 2000 mile border, violating the non-aggressive pact signed by the two powers. It was also announced that Britain, USA, China and the Soviet Union had entered into a treaty of friendship and mutual help for defeating the three Fascist powers (Germany, Italy and Japan). The announcement was a jolt to the detenus; till then their attitude to the war had been one of opposition, its character being imperialist. After Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union and the Treaty of Friendship and Mutual Help, did it continue to be the same? What would be the future of the world, including colonies and semi-colonies like India to fight side by side with the Allies without being hampered by British imperialism? What was the guarantee that colonies and semi-colonies would be liberated after the Allies won the war? Some saw a fundamental change in the situation. To many there was no change, as far as India was concerned.

At this juncture, Krishna announced a temporary suspension of classes. He began to think hard, and after a week he drafted a thesis which ran into 300 pages of an exercise note-book. Some others prepared separate papers, presenting different points of view. After ten days the whole yard reassembled to discuss the draft.

In his draft thesis, Krishna showed how a qualitative change had occurred in the international situation. World imperialism had got spilt into two, one part joining the camp of democracy and socialism and the other assuming the most monstrous form, namely Fascism. The war no longer remained an imperialist war, it had become an anti-Fascist war. The interests of the working class lay in defeating Fascism and winning the world for democracy and socialism. The vanguard of the working class in India should work out a strategy consistent with the tasks of the working class as a whole - namely, the defeat of Fascism. He avoided all jargon, confining himself to the formulation of tasks in general. For a scholar cut off from Indian public life for about two decades it was a remarkable exercise in the application of the laws of dialectics to the changed international situation. To have prepared a thesis in barely ten days was quite a feat.

But the overwhelming majority of the detenus did not accept his thesis. Discussions went on for weeks. There was much intolerance and

rancour. This state of affairs disturbed the sensitive Krishna who felt isolated, though a strong group of tested revolutionaries supported his stand. By the time the official CPI line reached the yard he had been transferred to another jail.

Dr. Krishna was released at a time when the Fascist offensive was at its height. But lack of elementary means of sustenance, frustration in marital life and alienation from the patterns of work in India drove him to search for a suitable job. He worked as a Professor in Belgaum University for some time, but resigned due to differences with the authorities. He went to Sri Lanka to join as Professor in Colombo University, but was denied the post because of official interference. He worked for the All-India Manufacturers' Association on a research project, the subject being "Industrialisation in India during the Second World War". But his work was returned because it was found to be "too polemical".

The only friend Krishna had in Madras was the late Darsi Chenchaiiah, one of the Ghadar heroes who was imprisoned for about six years in Indian jails after the First World War. He and his wife, the late Subhadramma, treated Dr. Krishna with affection, shared food with him and tried to keep him in good spirits. But no one could help lift Dr. Krishna's drooping spirits. His disappointments grew. He dragged on for several weeks living on bare tea. He died on December 22, 1948.

Dr Krishna's work, *The Problem of Minorities, of Communal Representation in India*, was written on the basis of his doctoral thesis. Its theme runs like this (most of the wording is the author's). India is a colony of British imperialism. Hindus and Muslims, Sikhs and Christians, all alike, are denied civil liberties. They are slaves in their own land. The term 'minority' is invented to further the interests of British imperialism and certain sections of the backward professional classes. It is an indispensable expedient of counterpoise of natives against natives. A minority must not be disloyal, seditious, etc. It must be moderate, nay reactionary. It crawls on its belly for 'protection'. It cries for artificial ropes and pulleys for buttressing itself. It means a rising professional class belonging to one of the various faiths or communities that demands a share in the government. The alleged grievances of a minority against the majority are myths. But they are adopted by a class that needs such myths. The friction between Hindus and Muslims and between caste Hindus and the Depressed Classes is to be explained by the socio-economic formation of the country, not by religion. Hence, communal representation in legislative bodies has to be abolished. The history of communal representation, is a veiled

plea for posts and emoluments. The only solution is to demand independence for India. The demand for abolition of communal representation is inseparable from the demand for independence. But independence is not a gift. It has to be fought for by building up a united national front against British imperialism.

To buttress his argument, the author quotes extensively from statements of British Viceroy and Secretaries of State, the leaders of backward religions and communities - and also anti-imperialist sections like the Congress and the Communist Party of India. About the Communists he says: "The Communists are today the foremost workers for the united national front against imperialism. They do not isolate themselves from the national anti-imperialist struggle. They are transforming the growing unity already achieved by the Congress into a united national front against imperialism."

Social and Political Thought of the Buddhist Writers is a work of Dr. Krishna, posthumously published by the Visalandhra Publishing House, Vijayawada. Quoting from Buddhist writings, the author concludes that Buddhism has trimmed and tempered the conception of monarchy with its humanitarian ideals. It has purged it of divinity, set aside the baneful influence of priests and sought the origin of authority in the people. It made kingship an office and relegated sacrifices to the background. It exalted the conception of equality, and on that ground attacked the caste system. *Theories of Kingship in Ancient India* is also a work posthumously published by Visalandhra. Quoting from several classics, the author concludes that the divine right of kings never existed in India in its extreme form. All that Hindu theory emphasised was the divine origin of the institution. It did not logically deduce the implication as was done in the West.

Political Thought in Dravidian Literature is an unpublished work of Dr. Krishna, preserved in the AP State Archives, Hyderabad, on a loan basis, along with other papers of his. It is a compilation of extracts from Tamil classics of the early Christian era and Telugu, Kanarese and Malayalam works of the early medieval period. Most of the pages are devoted to Tamil classics. Thiruvalluvar's *Kural* is a combined treatise on politics, economics and ethics. Its author addresses himself to the whole community of mankind, without regard to caste, class or faith. There is no mention of the divine right of kings, ministers, ambassadors and spies are mentioned in detail. Another classic, *Silappadikaram* by Ilango, advocates limited monarchy with five assemblies, a high priest and ministers. The rulers held before them high ideals. The notion of toleration had a high

place. Society is depicted as a combination of five different professions. Another work, *Manimekhalai*, gives an idealised picture of a Buddhist monarch. Caste is repudiated, and the doctrine of quality supported. Other works like *Chintamani* and the hymns of Saivite saints are also dealt with. Regarding Telugu works, political thought as propounded in *Amuktamalyada* of Krishna Deva Raya, *Neetisara* by Prataparudra, *Mitakshara* by Yagnavalkya, *Neetisara Muktaivali* by Baddena, *Paratatva Rasayana* by Phanibhatta, etc., are briefly dealt with.

Studies in Hindu (Indian) Materialism is another unpublished manuscript of Dr Krishna, preserved in the AP State Archives. The author here traces the history of materialist thought in India, beginning from Brihaspati and Charvaka and ending with Vemana. Source material for his study of Brihaspati and Charvaka (B.C. 1200-200) is divided into eight categories. The first includes texts which refer to Lokayata indirectly - Rigveda, Aitareya Brahmana, Aitareya Aranyaka, Taittiriya Brahmana, Yaska Nirukta, Upanishads, Puranas, Mahabharata, Ramayana and Manu Smriti. The second category includes Buddhist texts - Buddhist Suttas, Dhammapada, Sutta Nipata, Sanyutta Nikaya, Angutta Nikaya, Malinda Panho, Saddamma Lankavatara Sutta, Abidamatta Samga, Kada Vattu, Patimokka, Magavagga, Cullavagga, etc.,. Under the third category come jaina texts like Nandi Sutra, Anuyogadvarani Sutra, Jaina Sutras, etc.,. The fourth includes texts of opposition writers, who referred to Lokayata indirectly - Anugita, Asvagosha, Bhasa, Bhaskaracharya's *Brahma Sutra*, the works of Harsha, Kautilya, Krishna Misra, Madhavacharya's *Sarva Darshana Sangraha*, Panini, Patanjali, Sankara, Vatsyayana, Vachapati Misra, etc. The fifth includes important articles, essays and works on Hindu materialism, numbering 16. The sixth includes other works, numbering 25, which refer to Hindu materialism casually. Miscellaneous works, numbering three, fall in the seventh category. The last includes nine journals of learned societies.

Explaining the primitive character of Lokayata, the author says it does not explain the world as a concrete reality of substance and phenomena, but in terms of sensations; it emphasises perceptions as the only source of knowledge. It maintains that the four elements - earth, air, water and fire-are self - existing principles; their permutations and combinations produce an infinite variety of bodies. But the system does not explain the elements. "It is curious how the Lokayatas who protested against the mechanical forms of inference as a source of knowledge, fell into the same mechanical forms of reasoning, when they explained that the four elements become transformed into organism (which includes the mind as well as the soul). " In denouncing religion as the invention of

individuals desirous of deceiving their fellowmen, the Lokayats did not go beyond the ideas that prevailed in their days. They denounced the Vedas as authority, but quoted passages from the Upanishads to support their views. They do not hold with the Buddha that evil is the essence of existence; they hold that life can be enjoyed though it is mingled with pain. "Like Buddhism", said the author, "which is new wine poured into old bottles, Lokayata is new wine poured into old bottles. It is the natural-born body of India. It is cast in the mould of the country, and partakes of the contradictory streams of life in India."

Dealing with Kapila's (B.C. 700-600) Sankhya system, the author says; "Kapila, in spite of some orthodox leanings, is a democrat. All men alike have the power of effecting their emancipation, irrespective of caste... He, like Descartes, refused to accept the authority of anything which had preceded him. He would accept only what his reason or conviction would accept... The leading principle of Kapila's system is that blessedness of soul cannot be attained by religious rites but by knowledge."

The five post-Upanishadic materialists (B.C. 1000-600)-Ajita Kesa Kamblin, Pakutta Kachayana, Sanjaya Belatha Putta, Purana Kassapa and Makkali Gosal - are not, according to the author, direct materialists like the Lokayats. Yet they denounced ritual, life after death and the concept of soul as an active element in life. Sanjaya Belatha Putta, according to the author, is the father of Indian dialectics. Makkali Gosal conceived of the world as a rational, purposive order, "a system in which everything has that place and function as assigned to it which contributes to the well-being of the whole".

Dr Krishna discovers "materialist aspects" even in the Bhagavad Gita. Krishna, the preceptor, says the author, emphasised knowledge coupled with action, and taught unity of theory and practice. He did not deny the role of will; yet he stated that will itself is determined by nature. Nature, according to him, is self-determined in each individual. Both man and nature are determined. Within this determinism man is yet free to act. Consciousness is an instrument of nature when it acts. By propounding this idea Krishna undermined fatalism. He attacked the Vedas mildly (They bring no message to this fleeting illusory world) and speaks with contempt of the "flowery speech spoken by witless fools" who see nothing beyond the Veda. Nowhere in the Gita does Krishna speak of caste by birth. He speaks of caste formed according to nature. Each man possesses his own nature, whose promptings it is idle to defy.

Next, the author deals with the materialist aspects of *Prabhoda Chandrodaya*, an allegorical play of the 10th Century, written by Krishna Misra. The actors are persons like Charvaka, Buddha, Jaina and others, and qualities like prudence, virtue, passion, etc. The play is devoted to defence of Advaita against other schools. The ideas that emerge from the dialogues, according to Dr. Krishna, compelled the orthodox systems to reconsider their opponents' views, and in some cases, they were incorporated by later Hinduism, as in the case of Buddhism and Jainism.

Lastly, Vemana (AD 1400), though not materialist, attacked the evils of his day purely from an utilitarian point of view. His protest is of the same nature as that of the Buddhists - temperate and dignified. He did not deny God or soul. All that he denied was the efficacy of worship, pilgrimages and sacrifices, of idolatry and other devices of the Brahmans. He denounced the caste system in a way none had done before. He was more of a social reformer.

India and the League of Nations is an extensive study of India's role in the League of Nations, whose activities comprised economic development of member-countries, regulation of labour conditions, disarmament, codification of International Law, preservation of peace, child welfare activities, etc. Though India had a Legislative Assembly and a Council of State, delegates to the League of Nations were chosen not by the Legislature but by the Executive. India's role was a subservient one. The author shows that in crucial matters like reduction of armaments, constitution of the army and economic development, Indian delegates were no better than Britain's puppets. Regarding the princely states, the Paramount Power played, the role of ringmaster. The controversies which raged in the Central Legislature regarding the representative character of Indian delegations are dealt with to pin-point the opposition of the elected members to the autocratic policy of Britain. A silver lining, however, was the performance of Labour delegates in the ILO. (The reference, obviously, is to V.V. Giri, N.M. Joshi and S.V. Parulekar).

The Theory of Redistribution of Provinces in India. Its Origins and History. The scope of this paper is limited. It is concerned with the theory or redistribution of provinces. It does not deal with the movement as such, though some of its characteristics are mentioned. After a study of papers concerning the Bengal Partition (1903-1906), those concerning Bengal and Assam (1903-1906), the Montagu-Chelmsford Report (1918), the resolutions of conferences convened by representatives of the English-educated middle classes and others of various historical commu-

nities (Andhras, Tamils, Kanarese, Oriyas), the Reports of the All-parties' Conference (1928), the Statutory Commission (1929), the Second Round-Table Conference, the White Paper proposals, the Joint Committee Report and the New Constitution Bill for India, the author says that the origins of the theory lie in the growth of professional classes in the various backward historical communities. "The history of this movement is the history of the struggle between the professional classes of the historical communities and those of the provinces from which they wished to secede. On the part of the Government, it is a history of concessions and counterpoise."

The Second World War and Industrialisation in India is a product of intensive research done by Dr. Krishna after his release from jail. But it was rejected by the All-India Manufacturers' Association, which had entrusted the project to him. The theme of the paper runs like this: The State in India is an imperialist state, run in the interests of millocracy and moneyocracy of Britain. The chief problem of the young bourgeoisie is the market for selling its goods. It struggles for this market against the imperialist state. It is in this struggle that the nationalist movement was born. The history of industrial development in India is the history of concessions from imperialism. Between 1890 and 1920 industrial development was of limited character under the aegis of imperialism. The textile industry was the only large-scale industry run by the native bourgeoisie. But it earned immense profits during the First World War. There was further development during 1920-39, but that too was of a limited nature. Industries like cement, coal, cotton, piece-goods, jute, matches, paper, pig iron, sugar and steel ingots grew. There was a remarkable increase in production, especially in consumer goods industries. There was partial self-sufficiency in cotton, pig iron, steel, glass, paper, hardware and soap. There was intense political agitation and struggle for concessions.

But serious defects in the Indian economy came in the way of further progress. Firstly, feudal oppression in the countryside curbed the purchasing power of the masses. Secondly, there was better competition between big industrial houses like the Tatas and the Birlas and small manufacturers. Thirdly, industrial finance organisations had no control over banks, which were mostly in the hands of British financiers. Lastly, transport, shipping and automobile industries were not encouraged by the state.

During the Second World War, export of manufactured goods gave a fillip to the growth of certain industries (textiles, machine-tools, engineering goods, scientific instruments, drugs, heavy chemicals, etc.) This was mostly due to war requirements. Big Indian industrialists earned record

profits. Export controls, bureaucratic regulations, inefficiency and corruption acted as brakes on further growth. Also it was clear that the Government would not encourage certain industries, shipbuilding, automobile, aviation, iron and steel, etc., "We are for industrialisation", says the author. "We mean by this that we demand conditions for the free development of capitalism. This means a struggle against feudalism and imperialism. When freedom is won, we believe that as long as there is scope for development within the framework of a freed capitalist system, the working class, the kisans, the students and middle classes, will support the regime because they can develop to a certain extent. When the productive system becomes a fetter to further development, the working class and its allies can take the matter into their hands, according to the degree of their consciousness, organisation and influence over the masses."

Dr. Krishna prepared several other papers, which include the following. Factory Legislation in India and its Effectiveness in Bombay Presidency; Studies in Imperialism, Revolutionary Upsurge in India; Indian States in a Federal Structure; Separation of Judicial and Executive Functions with reference to Indian Magistracy; French Revolution; The Three Russian Revolutions; the Problem of Nationalities in the USSR; The Three Internationals; Diderot; Origin and Growth of Democratic Ideas in 17th Century England; Bacon(notes); Studies in the History of Philosophy(notes)

The degree of richness and advancement of a community is often measured by the number of creative scholars it has. Unfortunately, in societies based on exploitation, this is not so. Creative intellect not in consonance with the existing system and not readily useful for the perpetuation of the system is beyond comprehension. Perhaps Dr Krishna is just an example of how the intellectual wealth of humanity is not only allowed to go waste, but also undergoes intense mental torture in its struggle to lay bare the truths of natural and social laws. When will humanity learn to harness its intellectual resources, the most valuable of all resources, to full advantage?

From : Mainstream, December 20, 1980 pp. 24-26.

EDITORS' NOTES :

1. As per the available records, Dr. Krishna died on 18th December 1948. See, Andhra Patrika Daily dated 23rd December 1948.

REVOLUTIONARY UPSURGE IN INDIA

I do not claim any originality in this paper. All that I did was to apply Marxist - Leninist - Stalinist dialectics to historical facts in India. I have used the methods of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin almost verbatim. I did not indicate the sources and documents, as the paper is already bulky.

I am glad to note that this analysis corresponds to the analysis made by the Executive Committee of the Communist International (12th Plenum Resolution. It is out now.)

K.B. Krishna
December 7 , 1932

CONTENTS

1. Inevitability of a Proletarian Revolution in India.	4
2. What is a Revolutionary Situation? Objective Factors	5
Composing a Revolutionary Situation - Subjective	
Factors Necessary for Carrying the Revolutionary	
Situation into a Revolution	
3. What is the Indian Proletariat ? What is the Indian Bourgeoisie ?	11
4. The Ideology of Gandhi versus Revolutionary Ideology	12
5. The Historic Tasks of the Communist Party in India and Conclusion	15

REVOLUTIONARY UPSURGE IN INDIA

I

Inevitability of a Proletarian Revolution in India.

Marx told Bakunin once, that ignorance did not do anybody good. Certainly ignorance of India will not do anyone good. In spite of ignorance, historic processes at work in India evolve at such a tempo that they compel knowledge of the situation. It has been continually held by theorists of British Rule, that the situation in India is quiet and normal. The Imperialist war of 1914 disproved the falsity of the theorists of finance capital, who averred that war would never arise. But war arose. Similarly, despite romantic prophets of British hegemony in India, the situation in India is not only not normal, but revolutionary. For a Marxist, a revolution is impossible without a revolutionary situation yet every revolutionary situation need not necessarily lead to a revolution. The revolutionary situation in India today is paving the way for the inevitability of a proletarian revolution. It is to be on a scale grander than that conceived by Babeuf. It is to be a direct continuation of the October. It is to take place in a series of revolutions, like the French and the Russian revolutions. It is to be bound by an inner logic of events of a three - fold nature. Marxism is not a dogma but a guide to action. It does not indulge in vague prophecies; it does indulge, if needs be, in what Labriola calls morphological prevision. In such a prevision one could see a tendency towards three revolutions. The first revolution will be a bourgeois revolution against British imperialism. It will be a national war in alliance with part of the princes, the proletariat, the peasantry, and lower strata of society against Britain. It will be the first

stage of the revolution. Its primary object is to eliminate British competition with Indian capital. Its incidental result is the independence of India. It would replace one class by another, an Indian aristocracy for a British. The second revolution will be again a bourgeois revolution against feudalism, against princes, against all obstacles that stand in the way of the development of the bourgeoisie. Its object is the liquidation of Indian states. It would replace an aristocracy of birth by an aristocracy of wealth. Its allies are the same as in the first. The inner contradictions of the bourgeoisie manifest themselves. The lawyer, the money lender, the business man, the shopkeeper, all vie with one another. Capitalism freed from British and feudal influences, will make gigantic strides. The development of the proletariat both in theory and movement will equally be rapid. This conflict of classes leads to the third revolution. This is the proletarian revolution. It will be the first proletarian revolution in Asia. Just as the Paris Commune was the forerunner of the proletarian revolution in Russia, the Indian proletarian revolution will be the forerunner of proletarian revolutions in China and Japan. In emancipating itself from the trammels of the bourgeoisie, the Indian proletarian revolution will emancipate the entire order of her oppressed humanity. Such a proletarian revolution will not certainly be the last. History moves in contradictions. Here the Marxist fears to tread the future.

II

What is a Revolutionary Situation? Objective Factors Composing a Revolutionary Situation - Subjective Factors Necessary for Carrying the Revolutionary Situation into a Revolution

Lenin told us that the characteristics of a revolutionary situation are three

1. It is impossible for the ruling classes to maintain their power unchanged. There is a crisis "higher up", taking one form or another. There is a crisis in the policy of ruling class. As a result, there appears a crack

through which the dissatisfaction and the revolt of oppressed classes burst forth. If a revolution is to take place, it is usually insufficient that "one does not wish way below", but it is necessary "one is incapable up above" to continue in the old way.

This characteristic is pitifully true in India. The ruling classes in India have reached a crisis. The princes, the British and the Indian bourgeoisie have reached a crisis. This crisis in a development, reveals to us the discrepancy between the old form and new contents. It is showing the nearness of breaking point. Marx characterized the history of French convention, as one of class struggles. The federal convention of 1787 is also a history of class struggles. The American constitution arose out of these struggles. Likewise, the three round table conferences staged on a grand scale the Indian class struggle. Class after class pleaded for their interest, class after class stood firmly to its stand. The result is a crisis. The present deadlock is symptomatic of the crises that are inevitable in a phase of class struggle. The British too are having a crisis in their own country. The present national government is reformist way of bolstering up insurgent forces. It is paving way for social forces favorable to opportunism and social chauvinism. The historic Hunger March in London reveals the enormity of the crisis. The princes in India are no exception. They reached their crisis long ago. Monte Carlo, Aga Khan, Indore amply testify to this imminent crisis. This crisis of a threefold nature reveals two significant points. First, it showed the crack through which the dissatisfaction and the revolt of the oppressed classes burst forth. Second, it showed the incapacity of the ruling class to govern.

2. The second characteristic of a revolutionary situation is this. Wants and sufferings of the oppressed classes become more acute than usual. The untouchables are getting impatient. The peasants are getting proletarianized. Depression after depression drove out the industrial worker to the field, to swell the ranks of the unemployed. The break down of strike

movement intensified the discontent of the Indian working class. Everywhere there is discontent and groaning.

3. In consequence of the above causes, there is a considerable increase in the activity of the masses who in "peace-time" allow themselves to be robbed without protest, but in stormy times are drawn both by the circumstances of the crises and by the "higher-ups" themselves into independent historic action.

This Marxist analysis is clearly seen in the case of India. In the first place, the Untouchables have organized and roused themselves from age-long inertia and out of their own local experiences and struggles, emerged as a class-conscious entity under the mistaken ideology and misleadership of Gandhi. Secondly, the workers themselves have found the necessity for an independent action. the recent split of the Trade Union Congress is an instance of this kind. One section of this congress has repudiated the hegemony of the Indian National Congress. The workers, and peasants' parties under the leadership of the communists are independent working class organizations. They are drawn into the vortex of politics. They are going revolutionary.

These characteristics compose the objective situation in India. Without these objective changes, a revolution as a rule is impossible. The coexistence of all these objective changes is called a revolutionary situation. This situation exists in India today. It existed in 1905 in Russia and in all the periods of revolution in the west. It also existed in the seventh decade of the last century in Germany. It existed in 1859-1861 and in 1879-1880 in Russia, though there was no revolution in these latter instances. Because the subjective factors were not present. The subjective factors are the ability of the revolutionary classes to carry out mass actions strong enough to break or undermine the old government, it being the rule, that never, not even in a period of crises, does a government "fall" of itself without being "helped to fall". This is how a Marxist views a revolution.

These views were advanced many, many times, and were recognized as indisputable by all Marxists.

It must not be imagined that there are no objective features, which would make up a revolutionary situation. First, there is the possibility of an outbreak of an imperialist war where England will be involved. This time India will not participate in the war as she did in the last war. India will no longer be deceived. The bourgeoisie will be the first to proclaim so. The possibility of such a war is not remote. The inner contradiction of capitalism in the East, mutual sharpening contradictions of imperialist powers, the Anglo-Persia rivalry in the mid East, the base at Singapore, the white Australia policy are all explosive factors. It may precipitate England into an imperialist war any moment. This is India's opportunity. The imperialist war must be converted into a civil war. The chain of imperialism will be made weakest. The army will be won over. This will be the first step of the first revolution. Secondly, there is already a mass revolutionary flare like in Russia. Chauri-chaura, Amritsar, Jallianwallabagh, Mopla, — all brought the masses naked in to visible contact with the repressive forces of the armed state. These events are of great social significance in the history of class struggles in India, as the events of Peterloo or Washington. These shattered the faith of the masses in the benevolent rule of the British Raj. These taught them the necessity of possessing arms. These showed them the way to a future successful uprising. Such rehearsals as Lenin pointed out are necessary. It is necessary for the masses to go through such experiences. It is only out of such experiences that a theory and tactics of revolution could be built. Nor did the industrial workers escape such a revolutionary flare. The strike breaking movement on the part of the ruling class instituted a new revolutionary flare into the workers. The oppression of one class against another, the mutual rivalries among the bourgeoisie and the peasants, the caste groups - all stirred and stir up revolutionary flare everywhere. Thirdly, there is the British despotism un-

equalled in world save by Czarist despotism. Its methods are terroristic. Its tactics are brutal. It imprisons and executes. It deports without trial. It tries to stem the revolutionary movement by concessions. It ever fails like Czarist despotism to conciliate liberal elements. Its social functionaries are the priests who preach race war, and hangmen who neatly behead communists. It thrives on the inherent contradictions of Indian social structure, on the law of the unequal development of the classes. It is unashamed in its ruthless exploitation. Revolutionary elements exist in many countries in spite of everything, in spite of tear-gas, in spite of machine guns, in spite of marines. Fourthly, there are the contradictions of capitalism. No other land is exploited so ruthlessly as India. In no other land has capitalist accumulation thrown so many workers out of work. Such an exploitation is bound to affect the masses, to educate them in the school of reality, make them aware of the methods of capitalist oppression. Fifthly, there is the possibility of winning over the visible symbols of the repressive state - the police and the army - to the cause of proletarian revolution. The police have already shown such a possibility. The army is yet untouched. It is so juxtaposed that it is made impenetrable to revolutionary ideas. It is so built on class alignments so that it could rest loyal on the basis of mutual rivalries. Yet, such a situation can never remain unchanged. Lastly, there is the possibility of fraternal help from Moscow. It is true that Lenin said against Trotsky that building up of socialism in one country is possible but full of difficulties. Unequal economic and political development is an indispensable law of capitalism. On the basis of the law of the uneven development of imperialism, Stalin worked out and put into practice the Leninist teachings on the construction of socialism in a single country. This is not to deny the international character of the proletarian revolution. In this Stalinist position, which has been studied by the whole of the Communist International the task of preparing the international proletariat for a new round of wars and revolutions was realized. The present epoch in an

epoch of imperialism. Imperialism today is a policy of an international system of imperialist states against U.S.S.R. Hence a proletarian revolution in India cannot escape an international character. It would work in alliance with the greatest proletarian state in the world. The possibility of help from outside is not closed. These objective factors, prospective and positive, enhance the revolutionary situation in India.

It is in the role of subjective factors that we note certain basic weaknesses. The revolutionary classes are not strong enough to carry mass actions. The striking thing to note is the immaturity of the working class in India. It is immature both organizationally and ideologically. Already the growth of the Indian proletarian has raised revolutionary centres in Bombay, Calcutta and Madras. In spite of the weakness of the revolutionary movement the masses in India have experience of mass actions. They defied salt taxes. They refused to pay taxes. They made premature attempt at setting up a parallel government all under the direction of nationalist bourgeois organizations. All these have shown the possibilities of mass actions on a grander scale. The two requisites of translating the revolutionary situation into a revolution are a theory and a movement. Both are young. As the thesis of the twelfth Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International puts it, the tasks of the Communist Party in India are to strengthen the Communist Party, politically and organizationally; to train Bolshevik Cadres, to wage a stubborn struggle in the reformist trade unions, develop a wide anti-imperialist front; to liberate the masses from the influence of the National Congress, to make agitational and organizational preparations for a general strike, to give the greatest possible support to the peasant movement for the non-payment of taxes, rent and debts, and to popularise the basic slogans and the tasks of the agrarian revolution. It is the duty of the party to reveal to the masses the existence of a revolutionary situation, to make clear its scope and depth, to awaken the revolutionary consciousness and the revolutionary

determination of the proletariat, to help it to pass to revolutionary actions, and to create organizations befitting the revolutionary situation for work in this direction. To make clear the interrelation of classes in the coming revolution is the main task of a revolutionary party. The communist party in India is to strive for recognition. It cannot do by legal methods alone. People are so degraded and dulled by bourgeois legality that they cannot even understand the idea of the necessity of other organizations, unlawful ones, leading the revolutionary struggle. People have fallen so low that they imagine that the organisations owing their existence to police permits are a limit which cannot be trespassed. It is necessary to proceed to the building up of a revolutionary organization. This is demanded by a changed historical situation. It is demanded by the era of revolutionary activities of the proletariat. To proceed in this direction, is possible only over the heads of the old leaders, the stranglers of revolutionary energy, over the heads of old party by destroying it. The communist party is not a debating club. It is not a dormitory for noble maidens. It is an organization of the fighting proletariat.

III

What is the Indian Proletariat ? What is the Indian Bourgeoisie ?

In this revolutionary situation, the historic role of the Indian proletariat is clear. What is the Indian proletariat, that sphinx so tantalising to the bourgeois mind? The Indian proletariat consists of twenty million industrial workers, of which one million are railway workers. It would work in alliance with twenty eight million of agricultural workers. It would work in alliance with peasants, with 141,000 of marine workers. It would work in alliance with sixty million untouchables. It would cooperate with all those who subscribe to proletarian ideology. It is the party of the immense majority of the people. The Indian Bourgeoisie consists of the ruling classes both British and Indian. It consists of the lawyer, the money lender, the shop-keeper, the businessman, the speculator and the jobber. It consists of

those who are opposed to proletarian ideology. It consists of landlords, Zamindars. It consists of priests, and temple magnates. This is the broad alignment of classes in India. Scholars, particularly pedants, will never cease disputing details. What is the way to abolish these classes? It is impossible to annihilate classes without a dictatorship of the oppressed class, the proletariat.

IV

The Ideology of Gandhi versus Revolutionary Ideology

Opposed to revolutionary ideology, which is in the infant stage, is the ideology of Gandhi. For class conscious workers, Marxism is a serious conviction, and not a comfortable cover to hide petty-bourgeois compromises or a tendency of mere nationalist opposition. The ideological and political contents of Gandhism are the same. They are class collaboration instead of class struggle, renunciation of revolutionary means of struggle, and aiding the British government in its difficulties instead of taking advantage of its difficulties to work for a revolution. Marxism judges interests by class antagonisms and class struggle manifested in millions of facts in every day life. Gandhism dreams and prattles of mitigating antagonisms, arguing that their sharpening has 'harmful' consequences. Gandhism is an appeal to God and his mercy. Gandhi is a Philistine. What is a Philistine, Lassalle used to ask and he answered by quoting a well-known verse : "An empty hose, full of fear and hope for the mercy of God". Gandhism has degraded Politics to unheard of prostitution. Gandhi has become a veritable priest. He persuades the capitalists to start an era of peaceful democracy. He calls this persuasion "Non-cooperation". The cult of Non-violence has reduced India to the level of impotence. It is neither a central nor a fighting slogan. It is entirely useless, because it does not disclose the social content, the class content. It does not give a political, clear definition of the theory and tactics of proletarian revolution. It is a cheap bourgeois democratic phrase. Gandhism is counterpart to

opportunism. It means sacrificing to the temporary interest of an insignificant minority of the workers the fundamental interest of the masses, or in other words, an alliance of a part of workers with the bourgeoisie against the mass of the proletariat. All agree that opportunism is no accident, no sin, no slip, no betrayal on the part of individual persons, but the social product of a whole historical epoch. So is Gandhism. Gandhism is Utopism. It is appeal to abstractions, eternal truths and conceptions. It is seeking for a perfect social organization in Non-cooperation. The difference between Gandhism and Marxism is the difference between Anarchism and Scientific Socialism. Gandhi is the decadent of Utopism. He is stricken with incurable intellectual anaemia. In the name of 'Non-cooperation' he serves the cause of reaction. His politics is of pots and pans, of goat's milk and cow-dung cakes, of seaweed and saw-dust. Yet Gandhism is apparently triumphant. It has roused mass consciousness. It is an immense advance over preceding movements. Like Bakunin and Proudhon, Gandhi wields influence. Because Gandhism is necessary at this stage. As long as there is necessity for such sects, they persist. They linger in the new. Marxism waged a relentless war against Proudhonism, Bakuninism and Owenism during the epoch of the first international. So does Marxism wage a relentless war against Gandhism, Sapruism and Communalism in this epoch of Imperialism. What does it generally mean to take position in politics? It means

- 1) to give a formulated definition of the movement and the tactics, a series of resolutions in the name of the organization,
- 2) to issue the fighting slogan of the movement,
- 3) to connect the first and the second with action on the part of the proletarian masses and their class conscious vanguard.

From this angle, what is the position of Gandhism in Indian politics? In the first place Gandhi has no formulation nor definition of the movement.

His writings are adhoc. He is scarcely a well-read man. He is like Luther. His writings are for the moment with no method - 'livres de circonstance'. He is revolutionary and conservative. Anarchism failed because it tried to combine radicalism and conservatism. So is Gandhism bound to fail. Secondly, he has no fighting slogan. His slogan is walpolean: "Let sleeping dogs of reaction lie." Thirdly, since he has no theory, no slogan, he could not lead the masses as the class conscious vanguard of a proletarian revolution. In one word, Gandhism is a cult of incompetence. It is a culture of class collaboration.

It is for political change that Gandhism is looking for the salvation of society. The passion for the constitution is the most striking feature of the early days of the French revolution and Arthur Young found it especially strange to his English conception of politics. He said :

"Making the constitution is a new term they (the French) have adopted, as if a constitution were a pudding to be made from a receipt."

A constitution was to the mind of France at that moment the latch key to the garden of the Hesperides. The privileged orders demanded that the old constitution should be restored, the third estate that a new constitution be established. All blessings were expected to flow from this - the extinction of Feudalism, the end of centralized and despotic bureaucracy and the "career open to talents". But economic remedies few could be found to urge. Communist speculations, save those of Mably, Morelly, had not entered the head of one in a million of the population. So is it with Gandhism. It is after cheap constitution. A constitution to Gandhists is a Kaba of salvation. Gandhism does not understand class struggle, historical materialism, dialectics, dictatorship of the proletariat and imperialism. From the point of view of Marxism, it is ridiculous to seek revolutions in 'Conceptions' or 'Constitutions'. It must be sought in the difference of the interrelation of classes. To make clear the interrelation of classes in the coming revolution is the main task of Marxism.

V

**The Historic Tasks of the Communist Party in India
and Conclusion**

I traced the objective factors composing the revolutionary situation. I traced also the subjective factors necessary for carrying the revolutionary situation into revolution. A Marxist in the consideration of the moment must not consider the possible, but the actual. A Marxist, who in view of the possibility of the future stage, forgets his duties now, is liable to become a petit bourgeois himself. Yet, upon the analysis of the actual, I stated the possible not as a prophecy but as a tendency. A Marxist in view of the possibility of a sweet and pleasant future should not forget the unpleasant present. It is impossible to base Marxist tactics on unknown.

According to the thesis of the 12th plenum of the E.C.C.I., there is an increase of revolutionary unrest in the towns and villages and of suburban mass strikes. The same thesis states that the revolutionary crisis is retarded, primarily by the low degree of organization of the proletariat and the immaturity of the communist parties. However, one can note tendencies in the direction of wars and revolutions.

We must at the outset reject bourgeois theories of revolutions. Revolutions work underground for a long time before they break out openly. The French revolution had been slowly coming to a head for a century or more. It arose from the ever increasing divorce between reality and law, between institutions and men's way of living, between the letter and the spirit. Nay, it arose out of class struggles. The French revolution had been accomplished in the minds of men long before it was translated into fact. It arose from a disturbance of the balance between classes. It existed in the realm of ideas from the middle of the century. Likewise, one could note the increasing divorce in India between reality and institutions. Revolution in ideas has already taken place. Class struggles are becoming acute. The sharpening contradictions of imperialism are getting more and

more manifest. The proletarians are getting more and more class conscious. The communist party is striving for recognition. Revolutions are the culminations of class struggles. They do not proceed in a fixed order. Like Marx, let us take one step forward. Let us accelerate the pace of history. This revolutionary upsurge in India is paving the way for a series of revolutions and wars.

SIMON TO SANKEY

(A Marxian Study of the Imperialist Methods of Finding a
Constitution for India)

SIMON TO SANKEY

(A Marxian Study of the Imperialist Methods of Finding a
Constitution for India)

submitted to
Professor W.Y. Elliott

K.B. Krishna
April, 1933

CONTENTS

1. Introductory	20
2. Simon Commission and the three sessions of the Indian Round Table Conference	22
3. Sankey Scheme	26
4. Opposition to the Idea of Federation	30
A. From Indian States	30
B. From British India	35
C. From Indian Leaders	38
5. Conclusion	39

Introductory

The paper constitutions of Simon and Sankey represent the social bases of British Imperialism in India. They represent the Imperialist methods of solving 'antithetical' contradictions of capitalism, landlordism, feudalism and rising bourgeoisie in a background of decaying, poverty-stricken peasantry. They aim at tightening the bonds of British Rule by the inclusion of conservative element and the bronco-buster complex of "constitutionalism". They ignore the increasing class struggles between various classes that have sprung up since the advent of industrialism. They pass over solemnly the increasing revolutionary upsurge of Proletariat and the Peasantry. They cover the 'historical processes' of the objective situation with a smoke - screen of "imperialist solutions". Their social functionaries are "solemn declarations" and "second hand constitutions" - solemn declarations blazing a promised trail of "self-government" - "constitutions" sugared with left phrases. They epitomise charlatanesque theories which are bound to flounder in the fury of historical tempest - the theories of "civilizing mission" of "vested interests" of "white man's prestige", of "guardianship" "of the necessity of maintaining internecine strife" of the Gabriel over the white House at Simla. Their watch words are artificialities, suffocating revolutionary realism, the artificiality of communalism of "federation" of "Princes" - the realism of class struggle, of "revolutionary upsurge". They hoist a perpetual phrase of "constitutional stability" on the age-long soil of "social immobility". These are the social contents of Simon and Sankey schemes.

British Imperialism has not taken the slightest essential steps towards giving India even the smallest rights of a dominion. It promises Indian capitalists and landlords to continue the aimless conversation on the constitution, stipulating for itself the unchangeable and irreducible right of domination. It displays a grim humour when it declares that the main point of the future Indian constitution is the "federal" organization of India. It has, in its time not without cause, broken up India into a number of small sections and including the provincess of British India, cut out almost 560 Indian States. There the feudal landlord rule has been preserved in all its inviolability. There feudal landlords serve as the direct basis of British sovereignty. These feudal dregs understand perfectly that they retain their autocratic rule only because they support British Imperialism. An independent India would be the inevitable and irrevocable end of their own rule.

Baldwin pointed out-and undoubtedly correctly - that the basis of the Simon report was the idea of a reorganization of India on a federal basis. Of course when they speak of "federation" it is to be understood as more or less a caricature and distortion of the term. In his time, the great Perssian satirist, Schedrin, said that the Russian feudal - landlords, who could scald the peasants to death, complained that all they lacked for complete power was "self-government". Under "self-government" they understood the granting to them of the rights of a state power within the limits of their estates. It is approximately such a "free" order that the lords of British Imperialism are ready to dispense to India. They interpret "federation" in such a way as to mean that every feudal prince will, as formerly, rule despotically over the life and property of his subjects. The inclusion of these feudal princes within the federation means that they will decide the affairs of British India with their own satrap Yard-stick. This is the road of Betrayal that one has to traverse from Simon to Sankey. In short, the essence of Simon - Sankey is the special organization of "free" competi-

tion between feudal landlord despotism and liberal complaining under the high protection of the British crown.

II

Simon Commission and the three sessions of the Indian Round Table Conference

Whenever British Imperialism finds itself in difficulties in any of the areas exploited and plundered by it, or whenever it is forced to expand the social basis of imperialist rule in order to obtain wider native cooperation in its machinery of exploitation and its wars of aggression, it resorts to the appointment of "Royal Commissions" which go out to "investigate" the situation "impartially" and then make "recommendations" of reforms to his Majesty's government. In India, British Imperialist rule rests mainly on the support of the feudal princes, the great landowners, the industrial and commercial bourgeoisie, and the upper strata of the professional and educated sections - lawyers, journalists, university teachers - who represent the interests of the bourgeoisie and the landlords and who supply the leaders in their political agitation. Four separate commissions were appointed to deal with each category, but their work was to be closely coordinated in order to secure the best results for the stability of imperialist domination.

The Butler Committee¹ examined the grievances of the Indian Princes. The object of the Committee was to separate the area administered by the Princes, constituting one-third of India, from any political or administrative connection with the new reformed India that was to be created. The Indian Princes are now to be placed directly under the crown.

The interests of the landowners were protected by the "Agricultural Commission"² whose terms of reference omitted any mention of land tenure. its object was to examine how agriculture was to be improved, and the peasant given more facilities in order to raise his purchasing power

and make him a better customer for British manufactured goods and a better tax-payer for British Imperialist wars.

The interests of the industrialists are being protected by the so-called Whitley Commission on Labour.³ Its investigations on the conditions of labor are deliberately aimed at destroying the revolutionary trade union movement and the independence of the Indian working class.

And for the political representatives of the bourgeoisie whose agitation was growing dangerous in so far as they had succeeded in drawing in the masses, the Simon Commission was appointed in November 1927. The outstanding fact about the Commission was that its seven members, all Englishmen, represented all the three British capitalist - imperialist parties, the Tories, the Liberals and the Social Fascists. The report they have now published after two years and a half of "work" is ostentatiously declared to be "unanimous on all fundamental matters" and "will be found to be without dissenting minute". The report is being issued in two volumes.⁴

The first volume of the Report of the Simon Commission was published on June 10, 1930. The second volume appeared a fortnight later. The first volume is hailed to be a masterly survey of India's problems.⁵

In reality it contains the whole imperialist poison needed to create the impression that India is unfit for freedom and therefore needs British rule.⁶ It is a skilful piece of imperialist propaganda. It is the preliminary barrage of lies and deception, to cover up the infamy of the colonial regime of exploitation and robbery and to distract attention from the realities of the Indian Situation.⁷ The second volume deals mainly with recommendations. It is a well known fact that the commissioners ignored the peasantry and concentrated their attention on the aristocracy and the middle class.⁸ The Royal Commission on Labor is an ample testimony to this conclusion. The recommendations are not only designed to tighten the grip of British Imperialism but in so doing they are more reactionary than

the present constitution. Just as the Tsar Nicholas, by successive stages strengthened the grip of the autocracy over his Grand Duchy of Finland in the years before the first Imperialist world war, so is the British Government consolidating the grip. On its Indian colony in the period before the second Imperialist world war.⁹

Then come the three sessions of the Round Table Conference. It was convened to consider the next step in the solution of the constitutional problems of India. Parliament was represented at the conference by sixteen delegates - four conservatives, four liberals and an elastic government team. The Indian States were represented by sixteen Princes and Ministers, and British India sent fifty-seven delegates who stood for all European and Indian interests except those of the National Congress. The Congress had decided of their own accord not to participate in the proceedings. The conference was opened by the King-Emperor on November 12, 1930. It adjourned after fixing the date of the first plenary session for November 17. It met and lasted for six weeks. From the point of view of attainment of imperialist aims the Conference has been well staged and has achieved considerable success. The main objects to be achieved by British Imperialism are two. Firstly, it is the creation of constitutional and administrative machinery to hold in check the only real internal enemy of imperialism - the Indian workers and peasants - and to this end, to satisfy the antinational demands of various conflicting social, religious, sectarian and racial groups so as to perpetrate their differences and bind them more closely to the machinery of imperialist exploitation. Secondly, it is to organize the resources of India and Burma for war preparations against the only anti-imperialist state, the Soviet Union and against the growing power of the revolutionary workers and peasants of China.¹⁰ The first session showed the way to the realization of these objects.

In the interval the government of India's Despatch on the Simon Report was published.¹¹ There is very little difference between the Despatch

and the Commission's Report. Both aim at strengthening the British dictatorship of finance - capital.¹² The Government of India accepted the ideal of an All-India Federation but regarded it as a "distant ideal", "a remote speculation". The Princes propounded the idea of an All-India Federation as the only possible solution of India's political problems. The idea was not a new one. Sir Henry Cotton in 1914 pictured India as a collection of several states. "The ideal of the Indian patriot", he said, "is the establishment of a federation of her separate states, the United States of India". Federation was mentioned in the Montagu - Chelmsford Reports.¹³ It was suggested by the All-India Moslem League in 1928. It finds a prominent place in the Simon Report.¹⁴ This idea ruled the conference and the outcome was the Sankey scheme of Federation. And the capitalist press was mighty jubilant.¹⁵

The second session of the Indian Round Table Conference was formally opened on September 7 with a meeting of its chief sub-committee; the Federal Structure Committee. There has been no alteration in the character or scope of the Round Table Conference. Its activity and essence remains as before to rally reactionary elements to the aid of British Imperialism and to make changes for specific strategic and military ends and to work out satisfactory "safeguards" which will ensure the reality of British Imperialist domination in India being preserved while continuing to hold out the promise of future self-government. The chief characteristic of this session was the abject surrender of the Indian Bourgeoisie to the interests of British Imperialism.¹⁶ As a matter of fact Gandhi came to cooperate with the conference not to challenge it. In spite of his demagogic message on leaving Bombay in which he stated that although the horizon was black, "I shall strive for a constitution which will release India from all its thralldom", he did nothing to disturb the harmony of the feudal Princes, Indian landlords and British Imperialist representatives who were gathered in London. The object of his participation in the Round Table

Conference is to defend the interests of the Indian exploiting classes against the onslaughts of the Indian masses through the consolidation of the British over lordship in India.¹⁷ One thing that has been demonstrated in very striking fashion by the proceedings up to date is that the Indian national congress led by Gandhi represents not only the interest of Indian landlordism but also particularly the interests of Indian capitalism.¹⁸ The historical law that the national bourgeoisie, which in the first stages was connected with the national movement, necessarily goes over to the other side of the barricade, when the fight becomes intensified, when the masses of workers and peasants appear on the battlefield is being confirmed also in India.¹⁹ From the point of view of concrete results of a definite plan for compromise and partnership, the conference has been a fiasco. The outstanding result is that

1. there is no federal scheme worked out
2. there is no settlement of the Hindu-Moslem question.
3. There is no constitution for Indian responsible central government.
4. There is no agreement on the "safeguards" for the British power in India.²⁰

III

Sankey Scheme

The Sankey scheme is the product of the agents of British Imperialism in alliance with Indian Princes, landlords, representatives of the bourgeoisie and experts in religious and sectarian strife. The main features of the Sankey scheme are these. India will be a federation consisting of autonomous provinces and a number of large and small Indian states ruled by hereditary princes. Burma is to be completely separated from India and its future has been left to a special commission. The North-west Frontier Province is to be given autonomy with certain safeguards. Sind and Orissa are to be made separate autonomous provinces. The Indian Princes are not compelled to join the federation. Jinnah demanded a sepa-

rate federation for British India. Bikaner declared that 75% of the Princes will join. They have made it a minimum condition 1) that they shall have complete jurisdiction in their own territories without interference; 2) that they shall nominate their representatives in the federal legislature; and 3) that their treaty rights with the British crown shall be unaffected by the new constitutions. The federal legislature is to consist of two houses. The upper house called the Senate is to have 100 to 150 members. It will not be subject to dissolution but a certain proportion of members are to retire each year. It is not to be directly elected but only indirectly through Provincial Legislatures. The lower house called the House of Representatives is to have some 250 members, elected on a franchise which is to be based on property, educational and military service qualifications, and which is to be extended to not less than 10% but not more than 25% of the population and is to be further circumscribed by giving special representation to "minorities".

The provinces are to have their own legislatures and their own executives responsible to the legislatures with full control of provincial police, finance etc. but the Governor of the Province is to have an absolute veto. The Central or Federal Government is to be "collectively" responsible to the Federal Legislature, but a number of portfolios are to be under the absolute control of the Viceroy representing British Imperialist interests. In these reserved departments the British ministers will be quite independent of the Indian legislatures.

What are the reserved subjects in this scheme? In reality they are everything. They are:

1. all questions relating to the armed forces including fortifications, military transport, military and strategic roads and railways;
2. foreign relations;
3. declaration of war;
4. expenditure on the army for war purpose and for other "reserved"

subjects, that must be voted without discussion by the legislature;

5. the power of appointing and dismissing ministries;

6. the control of external loans and of any budgetary arrangements likely to impair "India's credit", that is British credit in the international money market;

7. control of the 'defence' arrangements in the North-west Frontier Province;

8. and the power of issuing special ordinances for "safe-guarding the tranquility of India.

It is clear that these reserved subjects - particularly the army and war preparation - will consume between 60 and 70% of the total revenue. Indian ministers responsible to the legislature will have to run India on the "remainder".

Another power reserved to the Viceroy is the right of "protecting minorities" which is the British imperialist way of saying "the right to make minorities quarrel among themselves". Who and what are these minorities? Everything in India is a minority except the Hindus - the Muslims, the Sikhs, the Christians, the Parsis, the Anglo-Indians, the British Community, British merchants in India and above all the "depressed classes". Even Indian labor which is the numerical majority is a "minority". It is obvious that all these "minorities" have to have special representation not only in the central and provincial legislatures, but also in the central and provincial public services - an appointment being made not because a man is qualified, but because the artificially maintained or created "minorities" have to be satisfied. And it is therefore no wonder that the carefully selected delegates to the Round Table Conference were unable to agree as to the proportions in which these minorities were to divide up the seats and are insisting, as true agents of imperialism, on separate electorates. The Viceroy therefore -

a) controls the whole apparatus of war;

b) has the power of suppressing the Press, meetings, organizations etc. by ordinance;

c) controls 70% of the finances for finding which an Indian minister is responsible;

d) has the power of removing any ministers or dismissing cabinets when he thinks them "unsuitable";

e) and has the power of maintaining internal strife among racial and sectarian groups whose existence is artificially maintained by separate electorates. But the outstanding characteristic of the new scheme is the deliberate strengthening of the war machine.

Firstly, the inclusion of the Princes means not only a tremendous police force against the workers and peasants generally, but a supply of trained armies to British Imperialism. Formerly these princes were not permitted to increase or modernise their armies and were, by treaty, obliged to maintain troops for imperial service under British supervision. Now these armies are to be mechanised.

Secondly, the North-west Frontier Province is being made a province under a Governor in order to satisfy the tribal and communal leaders but all matters of All-India importance and instance, frontier remissions and allowances, and strategic roads - are to be placed under the Viceroy as war-chief. A special commission has just been appointed to study tribal control and defence against tribal risings on the N.W. Frontier.

Thirdly, the elevation of Sind to a special autonomous province is a military measure. Karachi lies in Sind with its air base as the terminus of the London - India route, with its connections with the Persian gulf, and with its strategic motor road and railway line connecting it with Peshawar. It is the most important landing base in the event of a war against the Soviet Union.

Fourthly, without waiting for the realization of the federal scheme, an Indian military college is to be created to train Indian officers for the army

and particularly officers for the armies of the princes. This proposal satisfied the Indian bourgeoisie.

Fifthly, a military council is to be immediately created, including representatives of the Indian Princes in order to carry out the recommendations of the Sub-Committee on Defence, but in reality to work out plans for strengthening the "defence" of India for British Imperialism against the workers and peasants republic across the frontier.²¹

This, in short, in the substance of the Sankey scheme.

IV

Opposition to the Idea of Federation

A. From Indian States

On his return to India in March, 1931, his Highness the Maharajah of Patiala decided to reject the Sankey scheme of federation between the Indian Princes and British Indian Provinces drawn up during the first session of the Indian Round Table Conference.²² Other influential Indian Princes, one by one, accepted his lead. And by the time the second session of the Indian Round Table conference commenced its sittings in London in September 1931, the opposition of the Indian Princes to that scheme of Federation was complete.

Before the first session of the Indian Round Table Conference met in London, neither the Government of India, nor the Simon Commission, nor any student of Indian politics, ever visualised as an immediate practical scheme, a federal constitution for all India between the British Indian Provinces and the Indian states. The British Indian delegates and the British Delegates at the Round Table conference had decided upon working out the details of a federal constitution embracing both the Indian States and British Indian Provinces. Every one admitted that such a scheme was undoubtedly very ingenious. But no one thought as to how the scheme was to be brought about. Political leaders in British India were determined to demand that the British Government should immediately confer com-

plete responsibility at the central government in British India but they anticipated that unless the British Government were assured that it would be possible to incorporate the necessary safeguards, the Government would never accede to the granting of responsibility at the centre. They also expected that the presence of the Indian Princes in the constitution would be viewed by the British Government as constituting the most essential "safeguard". On the other hand, some of the Indian Princes, particularly the Nawab of Bhopal, the Maharaja of Bikaner, Akbar Hydari, desired that, at the earliest date, the Indian Princes should get rid of the supervision now exercised by the Political Department of the Government of India, which they came intensely to dislike. They believed they could defeat the Political Department and set at nought its importance and influence by consenting to accept a scheme of Federation between British Indian Provinces and the Indian States. Moreover, they had been consorting with the politicians in British India in sympathy with their nationalist professions. And thus it was that these two came to play with the idea of an All-India Federation.

When, during the first session of the India Round Table Conference, the scheme of an All-India Federation was mentioned, all the delegates of the conference were swept off their feet by the novelty of the scheme, and in the first flush of enthusiasm, the Delegates did not pause to examine all its implications. But Jinnah and Patro from the outset protested against the scheme and demanded its rejection and repudiation. They were in a minority. The majority clung to the Sankey scheme. This majority jubilation did not last long. Soon Patiala let his revolt and the opposition gained strength.

Patiala is the ruler of the most important Sikh state in India. He was the chancellor of the Chamber of Princes for the last five years. He has an influential following among the Indian Princes. He enjoys the confidence and friendship of many leaders of Indian opinion in British India. It was

largely due to his initiative that the idea of a federal government in India came to be considered seriously. Yet he was cautious enough not to commit himself at any time to any hasty decision. Even during the first session of the conference, he blessed the idea of federation only as an ultimate possibility. But on his return to India in March of 1931, he began to reconsider his views. He became convinced that the scheme could not be in the interests of the Indian Princes. He feared that the Indian states would be denuded of their sovereign power and authority, that the prestige and prerogatives of the Indian Princes, would have to be surrendered and that the Indian Princes would gain little advantage. For these reasons he wanted an alteration of the Sankey scheme.

In the first week of June 1931, Patiala issued an important statement condemning the Sankey scheme of federation. He asserted that the scheme was prejudicial to the best interests both of British India and the Indian States. He quoted some constitutional authorities maintaining that there never had been either federal tradition in India or cultural and political unity. He pointed out that the Sankey scheme was vague and indefinite, and did not mark any improvement in the legal and political position of the States. He discerned in the Sankey scheme the continuance of the present arbitrary powers of paramountcy, as well as the certainty of the disappearance of the smaller states. He stated that the scheme contained no safeguards against encroachment by the Federal Executive as far as the Indian States were concerned. He concluded :

“... Federation is a radical innovation. It subverts the very basis of the well-tried and time-honored political institutions of the States. It attempts to destroy their individuality and political culture. It is a revolution as far reaching as the absorption of states in British India ... It is at best an empty dream and a delusion pregnant with the greatest dangers to the very existence of States.”

Having condemned the Sankey scheme, he concentrated on what should be done when that scheme was rejected by the Indian Princes. He stated that it was still possible to construct a scheme which the Indian Princes could adopt to the advantage of themselves, British India, and the British Government. In his opinion, the really honest scheme, which would conserve the privileges and rights of Indian Princes, which would secure the interests of Great Britain in India, and which would also further the progress of responsible government in British India, was by making the Indian Princes come together into a compact, strong, and well organized assembly which would negotiate, discuss and work in cooperation with the coming democratic forms of government in British India. He desired not a federation between British Indian Provinces and individual Indian Princes, but a confederation of all the Indian states as the first necessary preliminary step towards the achievement of a federation between Indian States and British Indian Provinces.

Within a fortnight after his statement condemning the Sankey scheme, he secured several converts among the Indian Princes. In the middle of June of 1931, the Nawab of Rampur, one of Patiala's converts, stated that federalism between the Indian states and British Indian Provinces would certainly be commendable only in the fullness of time when the existing inevitable differences, between the two coordinating units could be effaced and make room for something really solid. Only after this has been achieved would it be fruitful to work out a federal constitution. Such a consummation was possible if all the Indian Princes really set themselves first to the task of educating and training their subjects in the art of responsible government. He believed that in the states, the reign of law ought to be fundamental. He realized that any such achievement could not be the work of a single day or a single hour. It had to broaden from precedent to precedent. Federation, while laudable as an ultimate result, was not practical politics for the present. He strongly felt that instead of

wasting one's efforts in behalf of what was impractical, all the Indian Princes should steadfastly strive for closer union, cooperation, and understanding among themselves. He could not approve of the propaganda that was being carried on by certain Princes for the elimination and negation of the Political Department of the Government of India. He considered that such a move to be thoroughly illogical and incongruous. He believed that the Viceroy, as the representative of the crown, must have a special department in charge of trained and experienced officers on the spot, and guided and controlled by a central authority. In July 1931, he reiterated his adhesion to the point of view of Patiala. He said :

"I still adhere to my original plea that the federal scheme in its present form - namely the Sankey scheme - without the necessary stabilising and accommodating influences to protect our interests, is fraught with danger."²³

Many other prominent Indian Princes like the Nawab of Bahawalpur, the Maharana of Dholpur, the Nawab of Sachin, the Maharajah of Cutch, the Maharaja of Rewa, the Yuvraj of Lumbdi, the Maharaja of Alwar, and the Prime minister of Indore and Bhavanagar, readily supported Patiala in his opposition to the Sankey scheme. Then Patiala and his supporters decided that it would be best for them to meet at a private conference and carefully review the situation. They invited the leading Indian Princes and their Prime Ministers to a conference in Bombay. The conference assembled in Bombay in the first week of August 1931. Patiala placed before them the expert opinion he had obtained regarding the implications of the Sankey scheme.²⁴ The conclusions of the expert opinion are these :

1. The Sankey scheme will result in the creation of a new Federal State comprising British India and the Indian States and the consequent imposition of uniform nationality and double allegiance on the part of the subjects of the Indian States.
2. The intrusion of the legislative authority of the Imperial Parliament at least in respect of federalized subjects.

3. Encroachment upon or modification of the rights and powers of the Indian States and the Status and dignity of their rulers.

In the light of this expert opinion the Indian Princes and the Prime Ministers of Indian States present at the conference came to the following conclusions :

1. That no scheme of union or federation should be undertaken unless the bulk of the major Indian States and important groups agree to join;

2. That as a necessary part of such a scheme there will have to be a confederation of the Indian States with such powers and authorities as are necessary for the exercise of the functions allotted to the States;

3. That the Sankey scheme should be so modified as to obviate the likelihood of any encroachment on the internal sovereignty or administration of the respective states by the Federal Executive;

4. That due and individual representation should be secured to the Indian States through their confederation in the Federal Legislature.

In this way the Bombay conference of Indian Princes gave substance and shape to the skeleton of Patiala's opposition. From then onwards the scheme of confederation was secure. A new situation in the destinies of the India Round Table Conference arose.

B. From British India

By the time the second session of the India Round Table Conference met in London on the 15th of September 1931, the idea of confederation had gained immense popularity among the Indian Princes. Many of them worked out schemes embodying this idea. During the second session of the Round Table Conference, the Maharana of Dholpur, the Maharajh of Indore; the Raja of Sarila, submitted to the conference three separate memoranda embodying details of the scheme of confederation. Of all these schemes the one prepared by the Maharajh of Indore was consid-

ered most satisfactory and was carefully examined by the delegates both British and Indian at the Round Table Conference.

The main features of the scheme of confederation as prepared by the Maharajh of Indore are as follows :

- I. The federating units to be
 - a) federated British Indian Provinces
 - b) the States collectively.

The states will, with the assent of the crown, constitute themselves into an Electoral College which may be given any suitable name, it-all the states will make one group or unit for the purpose of electing their quota of representatives to the Federal Legislature.

II. Federation to be for the purposes of specified matters of common interest only.

III. Structure and composition of Federal Government.

a) Legislature. There should be preferably only one chamber to which representatives could be sent by the states through the electoral college. The representation of the Indian States should be 50 per cent. If it is bicameral the states should have 50 per cent representation in the upper chamber, and representation on population basis in the lower chamber.

b) Executive.

1. The states need not insist on a fixed number of representatives in the Federal Executive.

2. The Executive will be responsible to the legislature.

IV. Method of Election of States Representatives.

The States will constitute themselves into a confederation for the purpose of federation with the British India. This will serve as an Electoral College for electing their representatives to the Federal Legislature. The confederation will be composed of representatives of sovereign states and of groups of the remaining states. Major states may be allotted a fixed number of seats to ensure their individual representation and some re-

gional distribution may also take place. For the purpose of election the principle of plural voting may be accepted. The number of votes allotted to a particular state depending on the state's political position, though population and income may also be given due weight.

The representatives constituting the quota of the States will represent the states collectively, and they will include among them representatives of the major states for whom seats will be reserved.

V. Federal Finance.

Federal Finance will be found from indirect taxation only, so far as at least the States are concerned.

VI. Supreme or Federal Court and Arbitration Courts.

There should be a court to deal with constitutional questions only. For disputes between the crown and the Indian States provision should be made that they should be settled by an impartial court of Arbitration distinctly separate from the Federal Court. The Arbitration Court should also decide disputes between a State or States and Provinces inter se, or between a State or States and Central Government of British India. Neither the Federal Court nor the Court of Arbitration shall exercise jurisdiction as the highest Court of Appeal.²⁵

This scheme of Indore differed from the Sankey scheme on the following main points :

1. The federating units in Indore scheme are only to be two, namely, British India and the States Collectively.
2. The representation of the States is to be collective and through members elected by the Electoral College.
3. The federal laws are to be adopted by the States and passed as their own laws, and thereafter would operate within the State territories not as federal laws but as State laws.
4. There is to be no new State created and consequently there is to be no question of allegiance from the subjects of the Indian States to the Federal Government as an All-India State.

5. Preference is shown to unicameral legislature. In preference to this scheme, some writers point out the defects of the Sankey scheme. It is alleged that under the Sankey scheme it would be difficult to come to an agreement on allocation of seats as between British India and the Indian States and between the Indian States inter se. Because on the basis of the States federating individually the smaller states could not be satisfied in the matter of representation, and yet it would be impossible to expect the smaller states to go into their respective groups at one and the same time and join the federation. Moreover, the states entering the federation at once would never be so large a percentage of the entire body of the States, and yet they would claim the full quota of representatives allotted to the States, although on the understanding that the extra seats would be released as the other States came in. Again, it is alleged that under the Sankey scheme, it would be difficult to federate non-autonomous provinces with Sovereign Indian States individually as some subjects will have to remain central. With these alleged merits of the Indore scheme over the Sankey scheme, Bapra, the prime minister of Indore presented the scheme at the plenary sittings of the Second Session of the Round Table Conference.²⁶

C. From Indian Leaders

Some of the Indian leaders too have expressed their opposition to the Sankey scheme. They assert that constitutional devices like the Sankey scheme of Federation is an attempt to sidetrack the obligations of British Parliament to inaugurate and enlarge responsible government in India. K.V. Rao wrote in the "Hindu" thus :

"Nothing is so well calculated to make one despair of the political future of India under Great Britain as the manner in reforms has been allowed to get into that extricable thicket which goes by the name of Federation ... The proletariat seem to have no option but to exclaim : 'Enough of your constitution making :

give us what we want if not in the way of self-government, at (In the previous announcements), there was not the remotest idea of responsible government in India becoming ever dependent on the formation of a federal constitution so as to include the feudatory states in it ... British politicians have no warrant to ask us to have responsibility at the centre with federation, or provincial autonomy without federation. Where does federation come in as an explicit or implied condition in the announcement of August 1917? The question of federation ought to have been ruled out of order in the conference ... Federation has absolutely no place in Great Britain's avowed obligation to British India or to feudatory India according to any declaration of policy till now made. And yet it is looming large as a veritable rock on which the ship of responsible government is to be wrecked."²⁷

V

Conclusion

We traversed the road from Simon to Sankey. We noted its contradictions. They are:—

- I. The Imperialists absolutely ignored the objective situation, and historical perspective. The objective situation in India today is composed of the following contradictions:
 1. The struggle between :
 - a. The British Imperialists and the Indian bourgeoisie.
 - b. The United front of the British Imperialists, Indian bourgeoisie, princes, etc. and the workers and peasants.
 - c. The Indian Bourgeoisie itself, nationalists and liberals.
The Nationalists again are divided into left and right congressites.
The Liberals too are so divided.
 - d. The Indian princes themselves i.e., between the large Indian states and small Indian states.

- e. Trade Unions—reformist and revolutionary.
 - f. Hindu, Moslams, Sikhs and other communalists.
 - g. Women and men.
 - h. Peasants and various strata—between town and country—between agriculture and industry.
 - i. Indian Bourgeoisie and Labour.
 - j. all sorts of permutations and combinations.
- India today is a veritable Babel of class struggles.

II. Secondly, the imperialists ignore the contradictions of modern capitalism, the reign of finance-capital, the exploitation of the poor and the plundering of the wealth of the country.

III. Thirdly, they ignore the increasing revolutionary upsurge of the workers, the proletarianization of the peasants, the growth of “declassé” and the discontent in the army etc.

The solution of these contradictions are not to be found in Simon or Sankey. “Federation” is not the means for such a solution. A proletarian revolution under the hegemony of the communist party of India, with the aid of the Communist International, with the slogan of democratic Republic of Soviets of India, on the principle of Democratic centralism is the trail that Simon and Sankey objectively blaze.

References and Notes :

1. Indian States Enquiry Committee Report.
2. Royal Commission on Agriculture (Abridged Report)
3. Royal Commission on Labour.
4. Indian Statutory Commission, 2 Vols. CMD 3568-3569. (1930)
5. Arthur Duncan, “India in Crisis”, 1931. p. 191. “It is perhaps the most illuminating book about India that has been written, logical, lucid and unbiased.”
6. See V. Chattopadhyaya, “India and the Report of the Simon Commission”. (International Press Correspondent, Vol. 10, No. 29, 19th June 1930. pp. 517-519.
7. R. Page Arnot. “A British voice on the Report of the Simon Commission” (Imprecor, op. cit., pp. 519-520)
8. J.F.C. Fuller, “India in Revolt”, 1931, p. 177.

9. R. Page Arnot, "The Simon Commission's Report, Vol. 2, Recommendations" (Imprecor, op. cit., pp. 535-536).
10. V. Chattopadhyaya, "Six Weeks of the Indian Round Table Conference". (Imprecor, op. cit., pp. 1241-1243).
11. Indian Statutory Commission Report, Vols. 4 and 5.
12. William Rust, "The Despatch of the Government of India". (Imprecor, op. cit., p. 1069).
13. Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms, CD 9109, 1018. Para. 349.
14. Vol. II, p. 9. I have traced the development of this idea in my paper on "The Federal Ideal".
15. R. Bishop, "British press Comments on the Conclusion of the Round Table Conference", (Imprecor, Vol. II. No. 4, 29th Jan. 1931, pp. 80-81).
16. Clemens Dutt, "The Second Indian Round Table Conference" (Imprecor, Vol. II, No. 49. 17th September 1931, pp. 895-896).
17. Clemens Dutt, "Gandhi at the Round Table Conference", (Imprecor, Vol. II, No.51. 18th October, 1931. pp. 931-932).
18. Manifesto of the League against Imperialism. (Against the United Front of the Indian National Bourgeoisie and British Imperialism at the Round Table Conference). (Imprecor, Vol. II, No. 50, 24th September 1931, pp. 913-14. See also G. Safarov, "The Treachery of the National Congress and the Revolutionary Upsurge in India". (The Communist International, Vol. VIII, No. 9, May 15, 1931, pp. 258-264).
19. B. Smeral, "Before the Second Round Table Conference" (Imprecor, Vol. II, No. 46, 27th August 1931, pp. 848-849). See also K. Milani, "The Tactics of the Counter- - Revolutionary Indian Bourgeoisie", (Imprecor, Vol. II, No. 50, 24th September 1931, pp. 912-913).
20. Clemens Dutt, "The End of the Round Table Conference" (Imprecor, Vol. II, No. 62, 3rd December 1931, pp. 1117-1118).
21. V. Chattopadhyaya, "MacDonald's New Imperialist Constitution for India", (Imprecor, Vol. II, No. 3, 22nd January 1931, pp. 46-47).
22. This has been regarded as the cardinal achievement of the first session of the India Round Table Conference.
Indian Round Table Conference, (12th November 1930 - 19th January 1931). CMD 3778. 1931, pp. 199-234.
23. Quoted in Rao, op. cit., pp. 58-59.
24. D. Madhava Rao, "The India Round Table Conference and After". 1932, pp. 60-65.
25. Quoted in Rao, op. cit. pp. 69-70
26. Indian Round Table Conference (Second Session) CMD 3997. 1932 pp. 181-190.
27. He then goes on to point out the inherent incompatibilities and radical deficiencies of the idea of Federation. See Rao, op. cit. pp. 73-78.

THE GREAT BETRAYAL

(A Marxian Interpretation of the “Nehru Constitution”.)

THE GREAT BETRAYAL

(A Marxian Interpretation of the "Nehru Constitution".)

submitted

Professor W. Y. Elliott

K.B. Krishna
April 1933.

THE GREAT BETRAYAL

A Marxian Interpretation of Nehru Constitution

The Indian National Congress, ever since its inception, has been a class organization of the Indian bourgeoisie leading enormous masses of the toiling population. In order to throw light on the policy of the Indian National Congress in relation to the Round Table Conference, we need only one episode in the past history of the Congress, namely, the famous Nehru Constitution worked out by a Commission appointed at a conference of all Indian parties, beginning with the National Congress and extending to organization outside it, the Liberal Federation, the All-India Muslim League, the reactionary organization of the Hindu Maha Sabha and the landholders' associations in the various provinces.

The Commission included the Congress leaders, Motilal Nehru and S.C. Bose—the left congressman—the moslems Sir Ali Imam and Qureshi, the liberals Sapru and Aney, and finally, Pradhama, the agent for British influence among the untouchables, and with the closest participation of Jawaharlal Nehru. This project was ratified at a conference of All-Indian parties and issued as a brochure at the end of 1928.¹

The plan of the Constitution bears a clearly expressed landlord-bourgeois character. It preserves the landed property of the land owner. It expresses itself in favour of the preservation of the despotic Indian princes and a whole number of other feudal relics. The All-parties conference put as the basis of Constitution the demand for the granting to India of the rights practically of a semi-dominion in which the supreme power should

be held by the British crown acting through its agents, the Governor Generals. In the opinion of the authors of the Constitution:-

“A bill passed by both houses of parliament shall not become an Act until the Governor-General signifies his assent... and he may signify such assent or withhold the same... the executive power of the commonwealth is vested in the King and is exercisable by him as the King's representative.”²

The same position in the Constitution is adopted both as regards the centre and the provinces.³

According to this plan for a Constitution, the Army is to be controlled by a commander-in-chief appointed by the King over whom the legislature will actually have no control. Essentially the same complete control is exercised by the Governor General in all remaining spheres of state and economic life in the country.

One of the central points of this Constitution is in regard to the question of federation and the Indian states. The authors of this report, leaders of the National Congress, Liberals and "Lefts" like Bose and the younger Nehru, put forward the idea of federation and preservation of the existing princedoms.

“If the Constitution of India is to be a federal one we think it might well be, the position of the Indian states in relation to that federation appears to us to call for a definite determination.”⁴

Concerning this “position” the leader of the Congress proposed to negotiate at a special conference which should comprise representatives of the ruling princes, of the British government and of the peoples of British India,⁵ being convinced that “at such a conference all difficulties could have been solved with mutual goodwill.”⁶ At the same time, Nehru and Bose promised that :

“If the Indian states would be willing to join such a federation, after realizing the full implications of the federal idea, and do all that lies in

our power to secure to them the full enjoyment of their rights and privileges.”⁷

This is only a small thing. The leaders of the Congress have also hastened to promise to the princes an additional guarantee; in the form of defence and mediation on the part of British Imperialism.

“...in case of any difference between the Commonwealth and any Indian State or any matter arising out of treaties, engagements, sanads or other similar documents, the Governor - General in Council may, with the Consent of the State Concerned, refer the said matter to the supreme court for its decision”.⁸

which consist of :

“Lord President and as many other Justices.... shall be appointed by the Governor - General in Council ... and shall not be removed from office except by the Governor - General in Council.”⁹

Besides the preservation of the princedoms and the rejection of independence, the leaders of the Congress introduced into the Constitution a further series of propositions amounting to a demand for the rights of a Pseudo-dominion a better jest at the expense of the movement for emancipation of the Indian people and aimed at still further underlining its position as a slave without rights of British Imperialism.

One of the basic proposals of the Constitution reads as follows :

“All titles to private and personal property, lawfully acquired and enjoyed are hereby guaranteed.”¹⁰

By this clause, Bose, Nehru and the other Congress members promised to preserve landlordism. They guarantee the payment by the peasantry of their indebtedness to the usurers. They guarantee the maintainance of the existing agrarian relations and all the feudal survivals in the social structure of India. They guarantee, by another clause, the inviolability of British enterprises.¹¹ At the same time, in order to throw dust in the eyes, they adopt a decision, saying nothing concretely, to the effect that -

“Parliament shall make suitable laws for the maintainance of health and fitness for work of all citizens, securing of a living wage for every worker, the protection of motherhood, welfare of the children and the economic consequences of old age, infirmity and unemployment, and Parliament shall also make laws to ensure fair rents and fixity and permanence of tenure to agricultural tenants.”¹²

The authors of the report only restrain the grinding down and oppression of the masses of workers and peasants by the promise of trifling reforms. The anti-popular and anti-proletarian character of this bourgeois - landlord - feudal constitution, which completely corresponds to the interests of British imperialism, stands out in every one of its words and clauses. Let us quote a few more examples : -

“The right of free expression of opinion as well as the right to assemble peacefully and without arms, and to form associations or unions is hereby guaranteed for purposes not opposed to public order or morality.”¹³

This is precisely what the Bombay factory owners declared demanding the dissolution of the Red Textile Trade Union, the Gerni Kamgar Union, and the arrest of its leaders. The Indian bourgeoisie and its legal advocates Nehru and Bose make precautionary reservations in case of arising of the toiling masses.

“Every citizen shall have the right to a writ of Habeas Corpus. Such right may be suspended in case of war or rebellion by an Act of the Central Legislature or by the Governor - General in Council.”¹⁴

The National Congress and the “defenders” of non-violence know what they are doing. They are preparing for a bloody settlement with the workers and peasants’ movement. The most radical proposal of the authors of this Constitution is that : -

“All citizens have an equal right of access to, and use of, public roads, public wells and all other places of public resort.”¹⁵

The leaders of the Congress in adopting this Constitution proceeded out of their desire to achieve an agreement with British Imperialism, to extract some sort of concessions and to corrupt, disorganize and disperse the revolutionary struggle of the toiling masses for independence, for the agrarian revolution for land, for the abolition of all feudal survivals, for the improvement of the position of the working class and for the perspective of a socialist development of India. Approximately from 1928, signs began to appear in India of the coming crisis and of the new upsurge of the movement for national emancipation. At about the same time, British imperialism, in accordance with its promises of 1920, to 1921, appointed the Statutory Commission which did not include in its composition any representatives of the Indian bourgeoisie for the purpose of preparing a plan for the new reforms promised ten years previously.

The Indian bourgeoisie in reply entered on a united front, beginning with the Liberals and ending with the Left Wing of the Indian National Congress and produced their basic document - the Nehru Constitution. In order to deceive the masses, the younger Nehru, who had most actively participated in the drawing up of the constitution, refused to sign it on the pretext that it did not embody as its basis the principle of independence. At the same time, he wrote : -

"We however decided not to oppose or to put obstacles in the way of the labours of the Conference ... and we will not put forward amendments or vote ..."¹⁶

Later Jawaharlal Nehru signed, along with the Liberals and Gandhi, the Delhi Manifesto, in which a request was made that India should be given the status of a Dominion subject to all kinds of limitations, and in return for which he promised complete solidarity, support, participation in the Round Table Conference, etc. The whole practice of recent years confirms the assertion that the policy of the Congress and especially of its Left Wing has been directed towards reaching a compromise with British

imperialism and preserving the leadership of the National movement in its own hands, exploiting this movement for the object of exerting a moderate pressure from below on British capitalism, at the same time disorganising the revolutionary movement.

This has been confirmed by the programme of Gandhi - Gandhi's eleven points - put forward by him after the session of the National Congress at Lahore, in December 1929, had adopted the independence resolution, and it has been confirmed by the negotiations in prison of the "arrested" leaders of the National Congress with the Liberals, by their sabotage of the peasant movement and by their disorganization and disruption of the Labour movement.

The National Congress covers up its policy of betrayal of the emancipation movement by playing at "opposition," a play which it is compelled to carry on in view of the fact that negotiations and bargaining with the British have not yet reached a conclusion and also, what is more important, in order to preserve its influence over the masses. At the present time, the economic crisis in India is growing more intense. The revolutionary emergence of the masses of workers and peasants is proceeding at a vehement pace. The revolutionary crisis is deepening. This faces the Indian bourgeoisie and the National Congress with the task of exploiting their influence over the masses for the purpose of forestalling a revolutionary rising against the British imperialists, the landlords, the princes, the usurers and the other exploiters.

From the very outset these tasks were very clearly in the minds of the Indian bourgeoisie. The "Bombay Chronicle," an organ of the Indian National Congress, wrote in a leading article :

"Everyone in Britain and in India will say without hesitation that only the Indian National Congress has made the Round Table Conference a possibility, and, if there is to be any kind of hope to be placed on it, it will only be as a result of the coming campaign of the Congress."¹⁷

Further, addressing itself to the Indian Liberals, the paper declared :

“A united front between us is possible in the form of the co-ordination of our programmes ... Congressmen have declared themselves at the moment for independence but this does not exclude the possibility of peace and an agreement with the British Government.”

And further,

“We are glad that there are Liberals who have not lost their heads and who understand that their highest duty is to exert the maximum pressure on the Government with the aim of securing dominion status ... At present there is not much place for constitution making, because the Nehru constitution remains in force.”

The division of labor is shown up very clearly, nor can the role of the Liberals as plenipotentiary representatives of the National Congress be doubted. Turning to the second task of the National Congress, the warding off of revolution, the newspaper writes as follows :

“To those who fear that Gandhi may become a cause of violence in the country, he himself gives the answer. If violence is floating in the atmosphere, it has been caused by the feeling of despair to which some have given way as a result of the oppression and torture of our country. While many are sitting with folded arms, Gandhi is exerting himself to neutralise or diminish this danger as far as it is possible to do so.”

And in another place :

“If there is any group in India which, without sparing its efforts, is attempting to prevent violence and anarchy and to preserve an atmosphere of non-violence, it is the Congress.”

These quotations from the leading articles of the Bombay Congress organ exhibit the Congress leaders clearly declaring : “A division of labour is necessary - we will disorganize the revolutionary struggle, we will exert pressure on the British, while you, Liberals, go and negotiate at the

conference and put the 'maximum pressure' on the basis of the Nehru Constitution worked out in collaboration with us." This plan is being logically carried into effect.

In order to deceive the masses of the people, the Congress has recently been compelled to push forward new "left forces." Besides the younger Nehru and Bose, there have been brought into the light of day the "Groups of a Hundred" in Bombay, the Roy agents, etc.

They have raised the question of the necessity of an economic programme for the workers and peasants, of the convening of a Constituent Assembly under the protection of British soldiers, etc. The left National - reformists are attempting to take the initiative in the railway workers' movement into their hands, they have talked about a general strike on the railways in the hope that the workers would forget that it was they who dis-organised and betrayed the strike on the Great Indian Peninsula Railway and who disrupted the Girmi Kamgar Union.¹⁸ The left National - reformists are hoping that the peasants will not understand or will forget how the National Congress also disorganized their movement for the non-payment of taxes, rent and interest payments to the Government, usurers and landlords.

Only on the basis of the policy of the Indian National Congress is it possible to understand the attitude of Congressmen to the Round Table Conference. The Congress, formally not participating in the Conference, (first session) actually took part through the Liberals Sapru, and Sastri. The Liberals collaborated in drawing up the Nehru Constitution, the Liberals Sapru and others, before their departure for London, had a number of conferences with the arrested leaders of the Congress, organized with the consent of the British Government in the prison at Yeravda near Poona. In these negotiations there took part the two Nehrus, Sarojini Naidu, Gandhi, the Liberal Sapru and others. On the basis of these negotiations, the Liberals went to the Round Table Conference. This is fully understood by

British imperialism. The "Times", in a leading article wrote on the subject of the Conference : -

"All other sections of British - Indian opinion will be represented in London and it should be remembered that, in essentials, there is no difference in principle between the demands of the moderate parties and those of the Congress Party."¹⁹

At almost the same time, the "Manchester Guardian," in a leading article wrote : -

"What is acceptable to the Liberal Sapru and his colleagues, the Indian National Congress perhaps will sniff at very suspiciously, but in all probability it will swallow it ... The difference between the Moderates and the extremists is now very slight ... The Indian Liberals will only accept what will receive the support of a great part of the supporters of the Congress."²⁰

These experienced organs of the British bourgeoisie excellently understand the situation. To complete the estimate, it is interesting to note the views of the "Economist" after the Lahore Session of the Indian National Congress :-

"The Viceroy obviously cherished the hope that his (Gandhi's) influence might be used for the peaceful development of India. The refusal of Gandhi to play this role will perhaps make the task longer and more difficult, but it serves as a compensation, which is not at all bad, that his presence among the irreconcilables will save India from more serious disorders which might take place if the opposition had been left in other hands."²¹

The role of the Indian National Congress is clear to the British bourgeoisie. The chief and basic enemy for British imperialism, for the Indian bourgeoisie and for the National Congress alike remains the revolutionary workers and peasants of India. This is what the workers and peasants of India need to understand.

The composition of the Round Table Conference is familiar - it is made up in the way that was proposed by the National Congress in its plan for a constitution; from representatives of the Indian ruling princes, from the British Government and from the Liberals, acting as political representatives of the National Congress. It should be remembered that Sir Tej Saprú, the Liberal leader at the Conference, signed the plan for a Constitution along with Nehru. At the Conference, as could be expected, the central question was the proposal for a federation and, no doubt, bargaining behind the scenes on the subject of economic concessions. British imperialism is attempting at the present moment to establish such a form of administration in India as will, while presenting certain privileges to the exploiting classes and offering them the rights of a junior partner in the general imperialist system of exploitation of India, at the same time strengthen the ruling position of Britain in the country. This is obvious from the whole course of the discussion; it is confirmed by the organs of the British bourgeoisie itself. Thus, the "Manchester Guardian", says :-

"The representation of princes in the All-India Federation will liquidate this conflict (between Britain and India) not because the Indian princes will send to the All-India Federal Parliament representatives who will enjoy more confidence in our country than the representatives of British India, but because they will introduce into the Parliament an element of racial, religious and political equilibrium ... And if such a degree of equilibrium is assured, then it will put an end to our past doubts and will give us the possibility to put before India without serious hesitation that for which she has so long striven, responsible Government in the centre and in the provinces."²²

"The Times"²³ adds to this that it will give the possibility of correcting the error that was committed during the period of application of the Montagu - Chelmsford reforms, which directed the attention of Indian politicians to the question of power in the centre "instead of concentrating attention on

administration in the provinces ... which in fact represent countries equal in size to those of Europe.”

The aim of the British imperialists is clear. It is, with the collaboration of the ruling princes, feudal landlords and capitalists, to alter the constitution in such a way as to guarantee their rule “for ever”, to decentralise the State administration as far as the participation in it of the population is concerned, and on the basis of the new relations and equilibrium of forces to grant a ludicrous, mutilated “responsible government” which would give the leaders of the Congress the possibility of posing before the country with their “victory.”

In essence this does not differ in any way from the plan of the Nehru Constitution.

The extent and character of the economic concessions is not yet clear. The notorious “eleven points” of Gandhi were the basis for business negotiations on the part of the Congressmen. It will not be superfluous to repeat these points :-

- 1 Complete prohibition of alcoholic liquors.
- 2 Decrease of the State-fixed exchange value of the rupee from IS. 6d. to IS. 4d. (in the interests of decreasing wages and increasing the competitive strength of Indian industry).
- 3 Decrease of land taxation by 50 per cent.
- 4 Abolition of the salt tax.
- 5 Decrease of military expenditure by 50 per cent.
- 6 Decrease of salaries of higher officials by one-half.
- 7 A protective tariff against imported textile goods.
- 8 Concentration of coastal trade in Indian hands.
- 9 Liberation of all political prisoners except those condemned for acts of violence.
- 10 Abolition of the political police (C.I.D.) or popular control over them.
- 11 Right of bearing arms in the interests of self-defense.

The various demands in regard to military expenditure, control over the C.I.D., and decrease of land taxation, etc., need not be taken at all seriously. The remaining demands, which have been repeatedly put forward by the Indian Chambers of Commerce, represent the minimum programme of economic demands of the Indian bourgeoisie. On this they insisted, but in vain.

The Round Table Conference began its business operations. The basic questions are clear, they have been worked over long ago. The Nehru Constitution represents one of the stages in its preparatory work for the Conference.²⁴

References and Notes :

1. I have already dealt about the question of 'minorities' in previous papers last year, so far as the recommendation of the Report are concerned.
2. All Parties Conference Report, p. 108.
3. Ibid., p. 111.
4. All Parties Conference Report, p. 82.
5. Ibid., p. 72.
6. Ibid., p. 72.
7. Ibid., p. 73.
8. All Parties Conference Report, p. 74.
9. Ibid., p. 112.
10. Ibid., p. 166.
11. All Parties Conference Report, p. 12.
12. Ibid., pp. 102 et seq.
13. Ibid., p. 102.
14. The All Parties Conference Report, p. 102.
15. Ibid., p. 103.
16. The All Parties Conference Report, p. 161.
17. January 18th and January 25th, 1930.
18. Revolutionary Trade Union Organisation.
19. On September 6th.
20. "Manchester Guardian Weekly," November 14th, 1930.
21. January 4th, 1930.
22. November 28th, 1930.
23. November 6th.
24. Valya "The Round Table Conference and the Indian National Congress". (The Communist International Vol. VIII. 202. February 1st, 1931. pp. 42-46).

History of Communist Activities in India

“Revolutionary theory is a synthesis of the experience of the working class movement throughout all lands - the generalized experience.”

- *Stalin*

“Only a Party guided by an advanced theory can act as vanguard in the fight”.

- *Lenin*

“The duty of the communist parties, is to mobilize immediately the working classes, to lead them, in their general struggle, to support energetically the smallest strike, and to develop the most active policy in the leadership of the masses ... The communist must devote great attention to the unemployed, attract these masses of exploited workmen, must paralyze all attempts of facism to win the working classes to its cause...”

- *Bukharin*

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	60
2. History	61
3. Public Safety Bill	68
4. Debates in the Legislative Assembly	69
5. A Statement of the theoretical aims of the Communist Party in India.	71
6. Appendices	73

HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES IN INDIA

I

Introduction

The history of the communist party in India is yet to be written. It is not yet written because there is no history. In the exact sense of the term, there is no communist party at all in India, although recently a legal party was set afloat. In spite of its apparent legality, it is still working underground. Communist activities, for purposes of this paper should be distinguished from the so-called revolutionary activities of Bengal and Punjab. They are not communistic in character, although they may have no objection to work with the communists. They are mainly nationalistic. They are more against British imperialism and racial discrimination. They are intensely patriotic. Again communist activities should be distinguished from labour or trade unionist activities. The communists have been active in these groups. The party at present is weak. Its organization too is weak. It has no leadership. Consequently the party works with the various organizations without sacrificing its fundamental principles. It works with the congress, the revolutionary committees, trade unions and peasants' parties. It is pursuing Leninist tactics. It is active in the trade union movement, the youth league, and peasant and workers party. At the Indian Trades Union congress in 1929 there was a split¹ between the moderate section, which was in favor of participating in the commission (Whitley) appointed by the British government to investigate industrial conditions, and those who wished to boycott the commission. The majority section of the congress was largely influenced by communists. Similarly the com-

munists exert considerable influence in the Youth League, largely manned by students. The peasant and workers party is definitely communist in initiation and control. Its influence at present is very slight. Even further to the left is a secret revolutionary organization.

In the history of communist activities, three cases are important. They are the Cawnpore case, the Lahore case and the Meerut case.² They led to the recent commotion over the Public Safety Bill. The activities received a stimulus when part of its program was adopted at the labor congress.

The opponents of communism here have the same mentality as the opponents of communism elsewhere. They freely speak of the flow of Red Money. For the first time, the Home Member thrilled the nationalist leaders in the Assembly, by tales of Red activities, Red flow of money. One member confessed that he never saw a communist in India nor ever heard of those activities till then. They also staged Zinoviev scenes. They fabricated letters. India too, had its Arcos Raids, its Jixes, its Birhenheads. A spectre is haunting India - the spectre of communism. It is high time that the rulers and the ruled should give it a recognition. It is high time that communists should openly in the face of the whole British and Indian opposition, publish their views; their aims, their tendencies with a manifesto of the party.

II

History

Communist groups have existed from the beginning as an illegal body. Their activities were conditioned by the fluctuations of the repressive policy of the British government. The most acute period of repression was in 1924-25 when there took place a so-called "Bolshevik Conspiracy Case" and when a number of active communists were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment at the precise moment when organizational results of

their activities were beginning to take shape. The government attack on the communist movement took a more sinister form during 1924-25 when a bogus Indian Communist Party was founded by very questionable elements. Following a "communist conference" openly held at Cawnpore in December 1925, it was possible for the communist groups to liquidate this bogus affair and make tentative approaches towards the legal appearance of a communist party. Within the groups there was and remains a considerable difference of opinion as to whether it is possible for a communist party to exist and work legally in the actual conditions of imperialist terror and provocation in India; however, a legal communist party was formed in Bombay in 1926 by the communist groups which held a general convention in 1927.

The party has not yet been able to develop into a genuine communist party, first and foremost because it did not show any signs of revolutionary vitality in connection with very important events. The problem of the organization of a genuine communist party as the vanguard of the proletariat, which must be the leader of the national revolution, is still to be solved.

Simultaneously with the attempt to form a legal communist party, there appeared in the various provinces a number of workers' and peasants' parties, in which the communist groups have taken a part. Growing originally as left wing organizations within the Indian National Congress, these parties have since acquired an independent status as self contained political parties. Of the four W.P.P's³ formed during 1925-27, those of Bengal and Bombay alone have been politically active and have given themselves a certain organizational shape. The Bengal W.P.P. (originally called the Labor Swarajya Party) was formed at the end of 1927 and has already held three annual conferences. Its policy is formulated in the report of the Executive Committee of the Bengal W.P.P. submitted to the last annual conference held in March-April 1928. The policy of the Bengal W.P.P. is defined in the resolution on the political situation adopted at the

1928 conference. After an analysis of the situation and a criticism of the Indian National Congress politics, the resolution concludes :

“Strikes and ‘Hartals’ must be encouraged, and the masses brought into the movement by associating their demands with the national slogans. The campaign must demand complete national independence, and a constituent assembly elected by universal adult suffrage, which will decide finally the relation of India to the empire and solve the pressing economic problems of the masses.”

In the beginning of 1928 a meeting of the “enlarged executive” of the Bombay W.P.P. adopted a number of important theses and resolutions as a basis for its party activities. In its thesis on the general political situation, the Enlarged Executive of the Bombay W.P.P. says :

“It is therefore, essential that working class organizations, the trade unions, and T.U.C. fight and obtain freedom from bourgeois control, under which most of them now exist. They must also obtain freedom from the reactionary and confused ideas which the bourgeois cultivate amongst them. These things require an independent workers' political party to educate, organize, and lead the workers in their struggle. Under the leadership of the industrial workers, the movement of the masses can go forward to abolish foreign exploitation, to establish democracy, and those elementary pre-requisites of life which 95% of the population of India still lack. By means of strikes, demonstrations, hartals and the more laborious means of organization and education the class consciousness and the solidarity of the masses will be raised to the level necessary before its task can be achieved.”

The transformation of the Left groups within the organizations of the National Congress into Workers' and Peasants' Parties as an independent political factor was one of the chief incidents in the history of 1927 (at the session of the National Congress in Gauhati, December, 1926, the Left wing was inadequately represented and badly organized; it made

itself heard only once at the Congress itself; but it was only at the conference of former political prisoners - the so-called "conference of political victims", held simultaneously with the Session of the Congress, that the Left succeeded in taking leadership into its hands.) The establishment of Workers' and Peasants' Parties became possible owing to the alliance of these Left groups of the Congress with Communists and proletarian elements. In this lies their importance as one of the organising factors of the national-revolutionary struggle, a factor which - given a correct policy - can develop into a party of the bloc of the proletariat, the peasantry and the revolutionary strata of the petty bourgeoisie, in the given stage of the struggle against imperialism. But, on the other hand, this petty bourgeois origin of the Workers' and Peasants' Parties makes itself still very much felt in the composition of the parties as well as in their programmes and activity. Thus it is pointed out in the resolution on the necessity of forming Workers' and Peasants' Parties adopted at the conference of the Bombay organization (February, 1927), that the existing bourgeois parties do not represent the interest of the masses. It is said :

"Therefore, the time is ripe for the creation of a political workers' and peasants' party capable of guaranteeing the social, economic and political progress of these classes, of standing up for their demands in the National Congress, helping with the organization of trade unions and emancipating them from alien influence under which they are at present, helping with the organization of the peasants on the basis of their economic and social requirements and offering energetic and business - like opposition to the government.

"In so far as the necessary premise for the carrying-out of this programme is achievement of complete national independence from imperialism, the Party will for this purpose collaborate with other organizations which adopt the same platform and are willing to fight for its realisation."

Thus, the Party deems it necessary to limit its political activity to

work within the National Congress; it attaches more importance to collaboration than to its independent role as a party.

In the address of the Workers' and Peasants' Party to the Indian National Congress in Madras (1927) no mention is made of the independent role of the party and it is even said "If the National Congress wants to carry on the struggle for national liberation it must become the party of the people."

More than that, no definite distinction is made in it with regard to the Swaraj Party. In the last report of the Bengal Workers' and Peasants' Party (March, 1928) it is said that the opposition of the Workers' and Peasants' Party to the Swaraj Party is not due to the fact that the latter is a bourgeois party, but because it is not putting up a genuine struggle for independence.

The main weak point of the Workers' and Peasants' Party is that, in practice, it is acting more as a Left wing of the Congress than as an independent political Party. The Workers' and Peasants' Party cannot develop into a party of mass national revolutionary struggle unless it emancipates itself entirely from the influence of bourgeois politicians and becomes transformed into a bloc of the working class with all the exploited masses under the leadership of the proletariat. On the other hand, it is entirely out of the question that the Workers' and Peasants' Party should be a substitute for the Communist Party, the organisation of which is absolutely necessary.

The Workers' and Peasants' Party

The Bengal Workers' and Peasants' Party is based on individual as well as a collective membership. In connection with this report of its executive committee contains the following statement :

"In the Course of the last year the individual membership of the Party increased and now totals 125 members-an approximately equal number

of peasants and intellectuals with a small admixture of manual workers. A branch of the Party is to open soon in Dacca. The total membership, including members in the branches, is over 10,000. The membership, social composition, activity and political education of the members are far from satisfactory. However, considerable progress has been made in all these directions."

Unlike the Bengal organization, the Bombay W.P.P. is based on individual membership only. The actual membership of the Bombay W.P.P. cannot be higher than the individual membership of the Bengal W.P.P. The Bombay Party has, however, succeeded in acquiring a predominant influence among the large industrial proletariat of Bombay. It was by its initiative in organization that 30,000 workers of Bombay assembled in a separate political demonstration with revolutionary slogans on the occasion of the Simon Commission to India, and in connection with the National campaign of boycott against the Commission.

It is, however, in connection with the present strikes that both the Bengal and the Bombay W.P.P. have shown themselves to be in the closest contact with the industrial proletariat in the big centres. Both in the railway strike in Bengal and the textile strike in Bombay, the members of the W.P.P. have not only taken the most active part in organizing strike action, but have also gained the enthusiastic confidence of the workers to the extent of being chosen by them as their leaders in preference to the bourgeois reformists who have up till now led the trade union movement.

A conference is now being conversed where the existing W.P.P.'s propose to form themselves into an All-India Workers' and Peasants' Party.

The development of the Left movement in the trade unions, which is opposed by the reformist leaders, has made a considerable advance in the last years. There is every reason to believe that the struggle against the reformist will become more intense in the very near future. In spite of numerous examples of heroic class solidarity among Indian workers

during strikes, reformist leadership is still tolerated in the trade unions. The predominance of the reformists, who have taken the trade union apparatus into their own hands, and who have the open support of the bourgeoisie, has resulted in the Indian Congress of trade unions embracing now only 150,000 workers in all the organizations affiliated to it. During strikes reformist trade unionists openly play the role of strike-breakers, making common cause with the employers against the strikers. In all strike struggles the mass of the workers appoint from their midst an active body which forms the strike committee and leads the struggle. But real struggle against reformism has not properly started in the trade unions. There are signs that in connection with the development of the labour movement, the reformist leaders intend to adopt the course of expelling from the trade unions the real representatives of the working class, following the example and advice of the representatives of the British General Council who favoured India with their visit.

But if the reformist leaders in the Indian trade unions are identifying themselves more and more with the British reformists who are agents of imperialism, the consolidation of proletarian solidarity between the mass of the workers in India and the British working class is a fact characteristic of the new stage in the national revolutionary movement in India.

The class consciousness, good organization and self-sacrificing spirit of the working class in India, manifest in the present strike struggle, which are directed against exploitation by British imperialism as well as by the Indian bourgeoisie, make one confident that the Indian proletariat has profited by the defeats of 1919-1921, has made the necessary deductions from the imperialist policy in India of the Mac Donald Labour Government in 1924, has correctly appreciated the role of the Indian bourgeoisie which has descended to the depths of a shameful capitulation before imperialism, and has understood, particularly in the last years, its tasks as the leader of a million strong peasantry, in the new stage of the revolution.

This means that the proletariat of India will build up, and has already begun to do so, its Communist Party, whose leadership will guarantee victory.⁴

III

Public Safety Bill

The growth of communist propaganda and influence especially among the industrial classes of certain large towns, caused anxiety to the authorities. In March, 1929, thirty-one persons were arrested on a charge of conspiracy to deprive His Majesty the King Emperor of his sovereignty of India. In order to combat the communist activities the government of India introduced a Public Safety Bill in the Legislative Assembly during the autumn session of 1928 (September 4th). It was directed against persons not being Indian British subjects, or subjects of an Indian State who might seek to overthrow the system of government established in British India by certain methods which may be summed up as the methods of communism. The remedy proposed was deportation by order of the Governor General in Council who was to be given power to remove, from India, British and foreign communist agents. After having been discussed for four days, it was referred to a select committee. In select committee, important modifications by way of safeguards were introduced. The duration of the Bill was limited, in the first instance to five years, and its scope was further reduced by excepting from its provisions British subjects ordinarily resident in British India. This safeguarded against deportation the large class of European British subjects who, though not domiciled in British India, have their careers there. Two classes of appeals were also provided. Of these, one, which was to lie to the High Court, was restricted to persons claiming that they came within one of the classes excepted from the operation of the Act. The second which was to be heard by a Bench of three Sessions Judges of experience, allowed the examination by such Bench of the merits of the order of removal, and if the Bench

reported to the Governor General in Council against the order, the Governor General in Council, was required to revoke it. On the motion that the Bill, as reported by the select committee, be taken into consideration, the voting was equal 61 against 61, and the president gave his casting vote against the motion. The motion was consequently rejected.

Between the autumn session of the legislature and the opening of the Delhi session at the end of January, 1929, the situation arising out of communist activities had, in the opinion of government, seriously deteriorated, and accordingly they considered it their duty to place a revised Bill before the legislature. The Bill could not be proceeded with and effect was ultimately given to the principles contained in it by an ordinance dated the 12th April, 1929, made and promulgated by the Governor - General. The ordinance gave government the powers which had been proposed in the revised Public Safety Bill subject to the safeguards set up therein. In addition to the provisions of the original Bill as reported by the select committee it made certain provisions regarding the seizure of monies.⁵

IV

Debates in the Legislative Assembly

It is very interesting to study the debates in the legislative assembly on this Public Safety Bill. The Home Member's Speech states the point of view of the government. He cited first the evidence which was produced in the High Court of Allahabad in the revolutionary and conspiracy case of 1924. He read extracts from the propagandist manifesto issued by communist party in India, from communist international (July 1928) and from M.N. Roy's letter. It was later found that the so-called Roy's letter was a fabrication. The secretary of the Anti-Imperialist League repudiated this letter. Zinoviev was staged in India with more farce and solemnity.⁶ The Home Member continued that communism was allied with nationalism and that the extension of communism to India could most conveniently be dated from 1920. Since 1927, there had been renewed activities. A great

deal of stimulus had been given by the arrival of certain British communists. The Home Member further defined communism with a view to entice the support of the nationalist members. In its relation to the Indian social edifice, communism would mean that states were to be destroyed, religious endowments, whether of temple, mosque or church, were to be confiscated, religion itself would have to go. Industry and trade in any capitalist form were to be abolished and the professions were to be submersed.⁷ Even this definition could not bring any support from the nationalist members.

The nationalist members with the exception of a very few, voted against the Bill. They also dissociated themselves from communism, like the British Labor Party. Some thought it was a vile thing. Some thought that India was a peaceful country and that communism had no chance there.⁸ Lala Lajpat Rai did not know which to choose communism or capitalism. Some preferred socialism to communism. All voted against the Bill because they saw in it as Nehru put, a veiled attack on Indian nationalism. Both the government and the Indian leaders emphatically declared against communism from different points of view. Some members were keen enough to gauge the situation. One member said that strikes were not due to communist or Swarajist influences. They were hunger strikes.⁹ Another said that the real problem was that the workers were hungry. The soil for communism was there.¹⁰ The debate clearly shows the bourgeois character of reformist Indian nationalism.

The Home Member promised to observe the frontier between communism in opinion and communism in action. In the first place, bureaucracy recognizes no such frontiers. Its coercive powers include ex post facto laws. Hence this guarantee is not genuine. Secondly, the Home Member failed to realize that communists have a theory for a movement of practical politics and not for the sake of theory. The Home Member cannot trap the communists by this distinction which is quite useless for a Party of practical politics.

V

A Statement of the theoretical aims of the Communist Party in India.

The task that now confronts the working class in India is to organize the revolutionary action of the oppressed classes against British Imperialism and the National Congress, to develop the labor and peasant movement, to organize a strong All-India Communist Party and mass red Trade Unions and to prepare for a general political strike.¹¹ In order to free the masses from the national reformist leadership it is necessary to carry on a wide campaign against the National Congress and in particular to expose the real role of Nehru, Bose and other leaders who still wield influence in working class and peasant organizations.¹² The congress has definitely and irretrievably become the Executive Committee of the national bourgeoisie, which is linked up with feudal and semi feudal landholdings and the exploitation of the peasants by the money lenders.¹³

The organization of the party must be sought in the intensification of the class struggle, a revolutionary upsurge and a revolutionary crisis.¹⁴ The tasks of the Indian communists are :

1. To strengthen the party and to convert it into a legal, centralized, All-Indian-Party.
2. To form and strengthen the revolutionary trade union opposition in the national reformism and the reformist Trade Unions.
3. To strengthen the existing Red Trade Unions and to form new ones.
4. To organize the peasant movement and fearlessly conduct propaganda for the slogans of agrarian revolution; and
5. To organize an independent leadership of the anti-imperialist struggle combined with a ruthless struggle against national reformism and especially against its "Left" varieties.¹⁵

After a militant organization of the Party, the next step is to translate the main tasks of the national revolution into action. The main tasks are:

1. Complete overthrow of the rule of British Imperialism and ousting it from the key positions which it holds in the economic life of the country. The Leninist demand for the right of self determination of all oppressed nations up to separation must however become the foundation of the national programme of every communist party.¹⁶
2. Abolition of Indian States and landlordism.
3. Land to the peasants through forcible expropriation of all exploiting interests and repudiation of all rural debts.
4. Radical change in condition of the workers; and
5. Establishment of the Workers' and Peasants' Republic.¹⁷

The next immediate objective of the Party is to bring about a radical change in the condition of the workers. It could be brought about by :

1. Shortening of the working day for the young workers, a maximum eight hour day as a transition to seven hour day.
2. Equal pay for equal work for young and adult workers.
3. Prohibition of child labor and state maintainance of children.¹⁸
4. Universal and free education up to sixteen years in the national language of the pupils; free food, clothing and supply of text books and school material to the children at the expense of the state.
5. Introduction of vocational training of the youth at the expense of the state and the employers.
6. Paid annual vacations for young workers.
7. State maintainance of the unemployed youth at rates equivalent to the cost of living; and
8. Social Insurance.¹⁹

Above all the theory of communism must be reflected in the movement. It must unceasingly reflect the objective conditions around and give them an institutional shape. It must continually resort to organizational measures like the strike, shop and peasant committees. This is the historic task that awaits the Communist Party in India.

Appendix - I
Communist Propaganda and Movement in India
(House of Coomons Debates)

1. Vol. 229, H. of C. Deb. 5S. p. 437 (8th July, 1929)

2. Vol. 230, “ “ p. 404-5.

Lt. Colonel Sir Frederic Hall asked Henderson for the plan of campaign outlined by M. Manuloki in 'Pravada'. A series of articles were written on 14, 15, 16, 18, June (1927) and on 2, 3rd July, in 'Pravada'. These made some references to India. That was all. There was no plan of campaign.

3. Vol. 231, H. of C. Deb. 5S. p. 1496, 1543.

4. Vol. 232, “ “ p. 8-9, 14-15, 511, 959.

P8. Wardlaw-Milne asked Benn (18th Nov. 1929) about the manifesto addressed by the Executive Committee of the Communist International to the peoples of India urging them to rise and throw off British Rule. Benn replied that he had no knowledge of it.

5. Vol. 235, H. of C. Deb. 5S. p. 6-7, 1385.

There was no information available regarding students in Russia.

6. Vol. 236, H. of C. Deb. 5S. p. 896.

7. Vol. 239, “ “ p. 896-7, 933-4, 940, 1505, 1923-30.

8. Vol. 240, “ “ p. 1588-9.

9. Vol. 248, “ “ p. 1734.

Benn “Communist activities during the last two years have been on a very minor scale”.

10. Vol. 252, H. of C. Deb. 5S. p. 793-4.

11. Vol. 257, H. of C. Deb. 5S. p. 783.

(The examination of these documents does not throw any light on the history of Communist activities in India. The debates were on party lines.)

Appendix - II

Communist Internationals

1. The Second Congress of the Communist International Petrograd-Moscow. (July 19, August 7, 1920)
 - P. 41. Roy is the delegate from India.
 - P. 42. 'The Situation in India - Report of Comrade Roy' - (Pravada July 29, 1920). He spoke of the 5 million workers in India and of the first strike of 1906. "There are elements in India to form a strong communist party".
 - P. 44. 'The Hindu Communists are duty bound to support the bourgeois - liberation movement without however merging with it'.
2. Ve. Congress L' International Communiste 17 Juin, 8 Juillet 1924.
 - P. 220-222 (1er Juillet 1924).
 - P. 15.
3. 'The First Congress of the Toilers of the Far East' held 21st Feb., 1922.
 - P. 16-17. Roy Represented India.
4. Revolutionary Radicalism (Report of the joint Legislative Committee investigating seditions activities, filed April 24, 1920, in the Senate of the State of New York, Vol. I 1920, P. 244.)
 - P. 433-4. Ahmed represented India at the Third International.
5. "Sedition Committee" 1918.
 - P. 96. Two documents are found. They are "The General Principles", and "Exposition of Revolutionary Methods".
6. "The East is the main reserve of a world revolution. The Proletarian Revolution is aiming first of all at English Imperialism."

- Zinoviev
7. "The Indian Proletarian Mass must be utilized by us as a reserve and bulwark for the Comintern in Asia."

- Commission on Eastern questions.

8. "Long live the militant working class of India! Long live independent India, liberated from Imperialism! Long live a single class International embracing the Unions of all Countries, races and Continents!"

- Executive Bureau of the Red International of Labor Unions

9. "Do not allow the fight against foreign rule to be checked, weakened and broken by diplomatic trickery, by the brutal terror of the English government, by the treachery of the leaders of the National Congress. Tear the mask from Gandhi and Nehru. Commence an open fight against the Imperialist foreign rule, for the independence of India with the light for the social emancipation of the great majority of the people of the workers and peasants."

- International Press Correspondent

Vol. 11, No. 18, P. 349.

Appendix - III

A League against Imperialism was founded at the Congress of Oppressed Peoples in Brussels in February 1927. The Indian National Congress was an associate member of the League. Nehru was in the Committee. Both the names were struck off now. Nehru is dubbed as Indian Kerensky. A branch of this League was started at Bombay on October 24, 1930.

(See I.P.C. Vol. 11, No. 4. P. 79)

References and Notes :

1. The Communist International, Vol. VIII. No. 18, Nov. 1, 1931.
The Split in the All Indian Trade Union Congress. 583-88.
2. Documents are not available here for an adequate treatment of these cases.
3. Worker's and Peasant's Parties.
4. "The Communist International", between the fifth and sixth world congress - 1924-1928. 'India' p.p. 464-477
5. India, 1928-29. J. Coatman, p. 6-7.
J.E. Woolcott, India on Trial, 1929, pp. 115, 173-5, 219, 222-3.
A. Fenner Brockway, 'The Indian Crisis', 1930, pp. 123-4.
6. Journal of the Parliaments of the British Empire, Vol. 9 part 2, (1928)
p. 1049.
7. Ibid. (1928) p. 1050 (See pp. 1045-1063)
8. Journal of the Parliaments of the British Empire, Vol. 10 1929, p. 479.
9. Ibid. Vol. 9, part 2, 1928, p. 1061.
10. Ibid. Vol. 10, p. 481
11. P.C. (Imprecor) Vol. 11, No. 22, p. 413
12. Ibid. Vol. 11, No. 19, p. 363
13. Ibid. Vol. 11, No. 9, p. 179
14. Ibid. Vol. 11, No. 22, p. 413
15. I.P.C. (Imprecon) Vol. 11, No. 30, p. 552
16. Ibid. Vol. 11, No. 19, p. 368.
17. Ibid. Vol. 11, No. 5. p. 104.
Also Ibid. Vol. 11, No. 17. p. 341.
18. The existing state of affairs is scandalous in spite of labor conventions. The recent labor commission has brought to light this scandal of child labor. Cf. the optimistic view of Murray in "Modern India" - a symposium 1931, edited by Sir John Cumming.
p. 292.
19. I.P.C. (Impecon) Vol. 11, No. 7, p. 341.

STUDENTS AND POLITICS

(Being the Presidential address to the Madras City Students' Conference held at Madras on 26th and 27th of October 1940)

International Situation

The war is now engulfing the rest of the world.¹ It is now being waged in Europe, Africa and Asia. The Havana Conference, the Three Power Pact and the German entry into Roumania have brought about a change in the International Situation. The change is as swift and sudden as the shifts and turns of the international armed diplomacy. We must adjust our thinking and line of action as swiftly and rapidly as the turn of events.

The Havana Conference registers the relations existing between U.S.A. and other countries of the western hemisphere. It is an index to the means that the ruling circles in U.S.A. have adopted to overcome her present economic crisis. The furious economic rearmament that is now taking place in Latin America in competition against German and Japanese capital is an index to the means that U.S.A. has adopted to overcome the crisis. It is at the same time an open declaration of the old Munroe doctrine in a new guise, an open declaration that the western hemisphere is her sole sphere of influence. Henceforth in the case, the frontier of U.S.A. is no longer the Atlantic but Britain, in the west her frontier is no longer the Phillipines but the Dutch East Indies and in collaboration with Britain, Singapore and Australia. In order to defend her frontier in the east, she is materially helping Britain short of a declaration of war. In order to defend her frontier in the west, and safeguard her interests in South America, she is working against the interests of the Axis-Powers notably Germany and Japan. That is the significance of the Havana Conference. That is the significance of her present economic rearmament in South America. For

what is economic rearmament, but exactly like other rearmament, a prelude to war?²

The Three-Power Pact is another landmark in the current history of the armed diplomacy. That is what war is, an armed continuation of politics as Clausewitz would say. This pact, writes Pravda, constitutes in effect an embodiment of the relations already formed between Germany, Italy and Japan on the one hand and Britain and the United States on the other. It is a further aggravation and extension of the war. "If, until lately, the war has been confined to Europe and Northern Africa in the west and China in the east, these two spheres being separated from each other, now an end is being put to this separation, because from now on Japan renounces the policy of non-intervention in European affairs while Germany and Italy, in their turn, renounce the policy of non-intervention in Far-Eastern affairs." The pact is doubtless to stimulate the intensification and extension of military co-operation between Britain and the United States. "One of the important features of the pact is that it openly recognises the spheres of the influence of the signatories and the division of these spheres between them with the undertaking of mutual defence of these spheres of influence against other states and certainly in the first place against Britain and the United States. Under the pact the Great Eastern Asiatic Empire is allotted to Japan, and Europe to Germany and Italy." Such is the significance of the Three-Power-pact.

The German entry into Roumania represents another landmark in the current history of armed diplomacy. It is a larger question of iron and oil. It is a larger question whether the Balkan States are to be the spheres of influence of Britain or Germany and Italy? Britain found herself faced with the task of forging new economic weapons to meet the German economic offensive in Eastern Europe. In July 1938, the British Government granted a credit of £ 6.000,000 to Turkey for the purchase of armaments in Britain - a measure described by Dalton as "a new line of departure, ... an act of

foreign policy and ... an act of financial and economic policy." On 30th November 1938, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Department of Overseas Trade, declared that in view of Germany's efforts to secure a monopoly of foreign trade in Central Europe and the Balkans, Britain would be "compelled to fight her with her own weapons." The weapons that Britain chose are political loans and other measures of economic rearmaments.³ This is in line with what Germany said to U.S.S.R. in reply to her note on Germany's intentions in the Balkans. The war against Britain is shifted to the Balkans by Germany and Italy in order to oust Britain of its political, economic and military hegemony in mid-East, in order to foil the attempts of the British to use the Balkans as a base for military protection of her mid-eastern possessions and as a diversion from the attempted invasion of Britain by Germany.

Nor must we forget the politics of oil in this armed diplomacy. From the beginning of the twentieth century, British industrial supremacy based on coal began to decline with the development of oil-fuel displacing coal. It is now clear that oil, not coal is the essential basis of military efficiency. In coal, she is behind the other powers, notably U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. Germany, if we exclude the conquered territories upto now, suffers from a total deficiency in oil. Hence the extension of the war into the Balkans for the oil-fields of Roumania⁴. Hence the desire of Britain to protect the oil-fields of Mosul and the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company in the mid-east.

The Havana Conference, the Three Power Pact and the invasion of Roumania by Germany, these represent the present phase of the relationships that exist between the leading capitalist countries of the world, and the extension of these relationships into an armed conflict. Taking into account the historical development of these conflicts, we cannot escape the conclusion that capitalist countries are at war among themselves. Why? What is the relation between War and Capitalism?

Political Economy of War

It is obligatory, nay, imperative for you to study the political economy of war. Wars told and tell heavily on the youths and students. They wear and tear them. The physical brunt was borne and will be borne by them. In times of war, they are deprived of their education and the Universities are closed. They are conscripted and with inadequate training they are huddled to the front. The technical revolutions in modern warfare do not do away with man-power. And the man-power is the student and the youth. For this reason you must study the origins and nature of wars in general and this one in particular. H.C. Papworth, Acting Director of Public Instruction in his address to the students of the Madras Christian College School asked the boys to guard the privileges of learning made possible at the school by the Church of Scotland Mission. He asked them to make the very best use of them for they could never know whether the hundred years of peaceful quiet and happy educational progress was going to be continued or interrupted. If it was going to be continued, well and good; but if by some unfortunate chance, they were called upon to give up some of their privileges, like the boys in England, they would then require all the resources of knowledge and character that the school had built up for them. Therefore he would urge them not to be led away by any false doctrine or by any who had not their interests at heart, (*Hindu*, October 6th). I am in accord with Papworth concerning this sentiment. You must not be led away by any false doctrine concerning the war. Unfortunately those who have not the best interest of the students, masses and classes are propagating a false doctrine concerning the war. It is for this reason that you must study the political economy of war.

How can Universities contribute to the strengthening of National defence? This problem is being studied by a group of the Harvard Faculty now engaged in organising the human and material resources of the local

University area in the interests of national defence. (*Hindu*, October 6th). No doubt the Harvard students will dissect the nature of "the interests of the national defence". Whether U.S.A.'s entry into war will further the interests of Fords, Rockfellers, Duponts, Morgans, Bethelheim corporations, and Hearst-Vandenberk groups or whether it furthers the interests of the common people, because wars now-a-days are made by the ruling circles but fought by peoples, many such groups will no doubt come into existence in this country. In order not to be led by any false doctrines concerning the war, it is the duty of the student today to analyse the war in its historical, social and class context and thereby reject or support such defence groups according to their conclusions. H.E. The Governor of Madras in his appeal to the Madras citizens said; "there are other ways to help too; educated people like you who could talk to friends and acquaintances and who could argue with people whom you meet in business, in social life or in your homes, could discuss with them about the origin of the war, why they are fighting this war and India is so vitally interested in these wars" (*Hindu*, October 8th). Yes, we would like to assure His Excellency to do that to discuss the origin and nature of the war. We would at the same time expect His Excellency to give us complete freedom of speech for such a discussion.

Many pernicious doctrines concerning the war are now in the air. Books on the war are now legion, as they were during 1914-18. Here are some sample opinions on the war.

Professor Murray Butlar, president of Columbia University said : "It is a war between beasts and human beings, between brutal force and kind helplessness". Professor W.G.S. Adams thinks that the root cause of war is sin. Ignorance, error, selfishness - these are the things which bring war⁵. Professor Gilbert Murray believes that the present conflict is between two principles or two attitudes towards the world - the cult of all normal human values or the cult of war⁶ and that Britain stands for a great

moral principle and that Germany stands for an evil principle⁷. The very same view is expressed by Professor Ernest Barker who repeated the view of Pius XII, in the Encyclical Summi Pontificatus. He says that the radical and the ultimate cause 'was' the denial and rejection of a universal norm of morality as well for individual and social life as for international relations⁸". The very Rev. W.R. Mathews views the war as a spiritual crisis, a culmination of a long crisis in human history⁹. But he adds that the search for raw material, religious fanaticism, the ambition of conquerors, the thirst for power and glory are also causes of war and in the present conflict most of them may be recognised as playing some part¹⁰.

These are some sample opinions. They are religious, abstract, propaganda-explanation of wars. I have no time to go through a minute examination of these views. This is not the place for it. But at the same time, I will acquaint you with my conclusions concerning the origins and the nature of the war. At the same time I want you to think out for yourself the true meaning of the war.

Leninist Theory of Imperialism and War

I present to you the Leninist theory of war as summarised by Professor Lionel Robins¹¹. As capitalism develops, the organisation of production tends more and more to fall into the hands of monopolies. As these monopolies develop, they come more and more, to control the Governments of various states. National policy is essentially the product of their influence. The state is the organ of the predominant type of economic organisation. It is the instrument of monopolist strategy. The operation of these monopolies is not confined to the area of the state in which they originate. Because of the economic interdependence of different areas, their interests extend far beyond the frontiers. And because there are many monopolies and many states, these interests are in conflict. The conflict is apparent in regard to raw materials. If monopoly profit is to be

secure, it must be immune from the control by other monopolies of essential raw material supplies. The great monopolies of the world are ceaselessly intriguing to secure for themselves, by the extension of the jurisdiction of the states they control, command over raw materials such as iron-ore and oil. But the main conflict is in the sphere of finance. Modern imperialism is essentially the clash of financial interests. The struggle for the extension of territory, for spheres of influence, and so on, is the struggle of rival groups of 'finance capital' seeking to extend their monopolies. The main clashes of modern imperialism are attributed to the operations of high-finance struggling desperately to escape from the falling rate of profit which resulted from the development domestic industry. 'The necessity for exporting capital arises from the fact that in the main centres, capitalism has become "over-ripe" and capital cannot find profitable investment'. 'The characteristic feature of imperialism is not industrial capital but finance capital. The five essential features of the imperialist stage of capitalism according to Lenin are as follows :

1. The concentration of production and capital developed to such a state that it creates monopolies which play a decisive role in economic life.
2. The merging of bank capital with industrial capital on the basis of "finance-capital" of a financial oligarchy.
3. The export of capital which has become extremely important as distinguished from the export of commodities.
4. The formation of international capitalist monopolies which share the world among themselves.
5. The territorial division of the whole world among the greatest capitalist powers is completed. Once this stage arrived, clashes of interest and war are inevitable. At this stage, imperialism strives to annex not only agricultural but even highly industrialised regions. Such is the Leninist theory of imperialism and wars.

Professor Robbins contends that this view is logically consistent¹² but does not fit in with the facts¹³. He admits that it does fit in with facts as an exception but not as a general rule. He further admits with Staley, "scrutiny of the diplomatic history of the last 60 years discloses many cases in which governments have acted on behalf of capitalists who have investments in foreign countries and a number of cases in which such pressure has led to severe diplomatic friction and military action. German action in regard to Samoa, American action in regard to Haiti, British and German action in regard to Venezuela such are cases in which the leading role of investment interest seems reasonably well authenticated,"¹⁴ I will not examine here the cases that do not fit in with the facts. I reserve them for some other occasion. But wars are of two kinds: just wars and unjust wars. Just wars are National Liberation wars. Unjust wars are Imperialist wars. The analysis presented here is that of an unjust war-imperialist war.

Let us now go back to the speech of His Excellency the Governor. He said: "We are sometimes accused of having started this war for imperialistic objectives. We are told that we started this war because a rival imperialism was coming to the fore. We are told that the war is a clash between British Imperialism and German Imperialism. what nonsense, How untrue..... I am told that we are not fighting for democracy .I am told that it is wrong for me to say that we are fighting for democracy. But we are, that is the truth ". (*Hindu*, Oct. 8, 40). To wage a war to make the world safe for Democracy, wrote Chesterton, is a dangerous trade. The last war belied it. Which view is correct? Society, wrote Durkheim, cannot rest on error. No amount of agitation and propaganda could make an error a truth. Discover the truth concerning the war. It is not enough if you discover the truth but as the late Justice Holmes wrote : "the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market." That is your mission. Never abandon your search for truth

Socrates-wise. Descartes studied science in order to learn how to distinguish truth from falsehood so as to be clear about his actions and to walk sure-footedly in this life.

Professors

“Beware of professors” warned Maxim Gorki. Antonio Labriola wrote, ‘Say what you may, the professors think there is nothing under the sun they do not know. They confuse and confound you. In Samuel Butler’s ‘Erewhon Re-visited’ you read of ‘Dr. Downie, Professor of Logomachy and perhaps the most subtle dialectician in Erewhon. He could say nothing in more words than any man of his generation. His text book on the ‘Art of obscuring issues’ had passed through ten or twelve editions, and was in the hands of all aspirants for academic distinction. He had earned a high reputation for sobriety of judgment by resolutely refusing to have definite views on any subject; so safe a man was he considered that while still quite young he had been appointed to the lucrative post of Thinker in Ordinary to the Royal Family. There are many Downies now-a-days in our universities who masquerade as professors. Avoid them. Pursue your studies independently. After clearing yourself from these trimmers and tinkers of the university, create for yourself freedom for the pursuit of knowledge. Amarnath Jha in his address to the Mysore University convocation said “A university should also be a centre of liberty if it is to possess the secret of perpetual life and health..... it must breathe the spirit of freedom, freedom to think, freedom to search, and investigate, freedom to argue about it and freedom to expound views, freedom to doubt and to deny, freedom to acquiesce and to conform”. (Mysore Oct. 14, 40). In your universities, schools and colleges, you must fight for this freedom . Amarnath Jha is with you. You must have the freedom to analyse the political economy of war even if you come against the conclusions of our ruling circles.

Thought and Action

But Knowledge is not for its own sake. Whoever approaches social problems with a purely intellectual interest, it was not Marx¹⁵. "I do not wish merely to think I want to act" wrote Fichte. To Descartes knowledge was only a guide for action. An anxious search after political truth, wrote Condorcet, was attended in Turgot with an equal desire of propagating it.¹⁶ "When science is produced by the historical movement and associates itself there within full consciousness of cause of cause and effect, from that moment it ceases to be doctrinaire and becomes revolutionary" wrote Marx¹⁷. All social life is essentially action and in the understanding of human action all problems find their solution. Man must by practice prove the truth, that is power and reality of his thought, its correspondence to the things of this life¹⁸. Therefore if we wish to arrive at any knowledge of real nature and real man, we must start with real nature and real man as they are found in experience in real life. Marx wrote to Ruge in September 1843, "It does not hinder us from linking our critique (of philosophy) to the critique of politics, from linking it to partisanship in politics that is to real struggle and from identifying it with them. We do not come before the world as doctrinaires with a new principle. Here is the truth, here kneel down. We develop for the world new principles from principles of the world".

It is here that I part company with Amarnath Jha. He said, "Action implies partisanship, the pledging of faiths, affixing of labels ;.....study, contemplation, discussion in a free and frank atmosphere there must be but there must at the same time be a ban on active participation in the dire notice of conflict, for a student must be a student." Unfortunately he cannot be. How can he test his learning without participation in the actual struggles? History is against such advice. Truth is partisan. It is discovered in the world of lies and errors. Hence for recognition in the market of life the discover of truth has to be a partisan. Those who profess non-

partisan-ship are often the worst offenders of partisanship. Take Nassau William Senior, the First Professor of Political Economy at Oxford. In his "Outline of the Science of Political Economy" he wrote, "The business of a political Economist is neither to recommend nor to dissuade, but to state general principles which it is fatal to neglect, but neither advisable, nor perhaps practicable, to use the sole, or even the principal guides in the actual conduct of affairs"¹⁹. He did not put this into practice. At the instance of the factory owners of Manchester, he fought on their behalf against the newly passed Factory Act and also against the Ten Hours agitation. He advanced the famous theory that the employers derive their profits from the last hour of the workers and as such they should not agitate for a reduction in hours. His theory was bad enough. But against his professed impartiality, he became the tool of the Manchester Capitalists²⁰. He was of a type of the economist who takes an important part in the affairs of Government²¹.

It is also the same with politics. You cannot but be a partisan. Politics are a matter for passionate efforts. De Tocqueville wrote to Corcelle on 11th October 1846, "You make my mouth water with your picture of the satisfaction there is to be found outside the political area-no quarrels, no temptations, a contemplation of all things in an atmosphere of eternal serenity and impartiality. I tell you that I feel like beating you when I hear you talk like that! Good God, my dear friend, that is not politics. We have a goal that is great and good. How can we reach it without passionate effort?"²² "Politics is not a pavement of Nevsky prospect. Politics is not a dormitory for noble maidens to live in" wrote Lenin.

Some City Problems

Disinterestedness is a thing that I cannot understand. To be interested in a particular problem is no bar to arriving at right conclusions. It is with this view of bridging the gulf between theory and practice that I rec-

commend you to the study of your city's problems. The three problems that need urgent investigation are : 1. The beggar problem 2. The problem of labourers who draw cart-loads or hand-cart coolies. 3. and the rickshaw-wallahs.

The Beggar Problem : I need not tell you anything new concerning their wretched condition. A pavement is their colony, often the worst slum in the city. The gutter is their hearth and home, where they live and die. The spectacle of a diseased beggar is something that no civilised community can tolerate. Already some social service workers in collaboration with the corporation are at work on this question. Get in touch with these workers and pursue your studies independently. Test what you have learnt at your schools and colleges in actual life. Go to the root of the matter and analyse the social conditions that give rise to this problem. Present your reports to your departments and use them as basis for action. Agitate, organise and demonstrate your sympathy with the beggar problem.

Labourers who draw cart loads : These human beasts, dumb starving labourers, with their feet burning on the tarred roads with no shoes on but only a rag tied around their feet, sweating, groaning under weight they cannot really carry, beyond endurance, resigned to their fates, some pushing with their heads the hind-part of the cart, drag tons of cart-loads any day in the city. Who employs them? What are their wages Their conditions of living, their social background - these are the problems to be investigated.

Rickshaw - Wallaas : Their condition is equally deplorable. They do not often get paid but in turn get abused. The rickshaw and the coolie are symbols of our, nay, even Asiatic slavery. The Madras Government in a recent communique expressed its desire to restrict their number. If their number is restricted, what about those who will be thrown out of employment? Has the Government any plan by which they could absorb 'the thrown out,' the 'unemployed?' Where do the Rickshaw - wallahs get their

rickshaws? Under what conditions? Their wages? Any organisation among them? Such are the problems to be investigated. In studying the problems at such close range, participating in life's actual struggles, you cease to become doctrinaire and sectarian. We will be called Utopians if we merely wish for the abolition of these social evils without analysis. Because, the analysis of a question is its solution. "It is not enough to desire the collapse of these forms. One must know in obedience to what laws they came into being, in order to know how to act within the framework of these laws, since to act against them, whether deliberately or not, in blind ignorance of the causes and character, would be a futile and suicidal act and would, by creating chaos, defeat and demoralise, revolutionary class and so prolong the existing agony" thus Marx warned the Utopians²³.

Method of Study

The method you follow in the pursuit of your researches is important. It must be all-embracing and encyclopaedic. Your branch of study must feel the impulse of science. Science means accuracy, a search for general causes. The inter-dependence of social sciences must not be forgotten. The moment you choose Law, wrote Holmes, all avenues must be open for you. It is the same with Economics and politics. "It is wrong" said Stalin "to divorce politics from economics. We cannot go away from economics any more than we can go away from politics. For convenience of study, people usually separate methodologically questions of economics from questions of politics. But this is done only methodologically artificially, only for the convenience of study. In life, on the contrary, in practice, politics and economics are inseparable. They exist together and act together. And he who thinks of separating in our practical politics, economics from politics, of strengthening economic work at the price of detracting from political work, or on the contrary of strengthening political

work at the price of detracting from economic work, he must necessarily find himself at an impasse²⁴. Politics is for Marx a branch of sociology²⁵. But unfortunately the sciences are studied in abstraction. That is why political economy was called a dismal science by Carlyle. "The economists so seldom derive from their facts the theoretical knowledge they require because they do not ask from their facts the kind of question facts can answer²⁶." The social topics which they themselves assume, but do not settle, belong to regions of enquiry which are outside, i.e. either beyond or beneath, the typical economist's tastes and powers. They are particles of concrete and tangible reality, their study demands constant reference to the whole combination of social forces, their logical problem is that of multiple interrelation - indeed an interrelation so multiple as to make the work of abstraction impossible and undesirable²⁷. To free the sciences from an abstraction and yet to bring them in correspondence with things in life is a difficult task. At the same time we must recognise the limitations of this method. 'The formulation', in thought of an exact picture of the world system in which we live is impossible for us and will always remain impossible Mankind therefore finds itself faced with a contradiction: On one hand, it has to gain an exhaustive knowledge of the world-system in all its inter-relations; and on the other hand, because of the nature both of the man and of the world system, this task can never be completely fulfilled Each mental image is and remains in actual fact limited, objectively through the historical stage and subjectively through the physical and mental constitution of its maker ..." So wrote Engels²⁸. But it does not mean we do not arrive at relative truths. Marx studied the problems in this light. Marx was for Moses Hess a combination of Rousseau, Voltaire, Holbach, Lessing, Heine and Hegel rolled into one²⁹. The historian Koppen called him a "warehouse of ideas, a manufactory of them"³⁰. He was a walking encyclopaedia, a lion, a mastermind. That is why he was able to write such a work as *Capital*. 'Das Kapital' writes Banedetto

Croce, has been taken in its time for a Treatise on Economics, a Philosophy of History, a system of Laws of Sociology, a moral and political indictment and even in some opinions, for a historical narrative³¹". Only Marx was able to carry on in his studies such many-sided investigations. Equipped with such a fund of knowledge, Marx found the philosophical grounding wanting in the economists. He found it wanting even in Prondhon. All developments of political economy, wrote Marx, by which he meant the bourgeois economics, "presuppose private property". Proudhon was the first to criticise this basis though he tried to solve the problem within the system of private property. To Marx the essence of political economy was that it is a science of private property. Marx claimed for Feurbach the merit of making a critical economics possible. He paid him the following tribute. "Political economy owes its true foundation to the discoveries of Feurbatch ... From Feurbach dates the first positive humanistic and naturalistic critical science". Such science was made possible by Feurbach with two of his ideas namely the exteriorisation of human values and humanity. Marx completed the work of Proudhon and Feurbach wading laboriously and critically through English classical political economy and presented to the world his '*Capital*'. He grounded political economy into philosophy, humanised it and reduced it from a science of private property to a science of the emancipation of the proletariat. That in fact is the essence of '*Capital*'.

Again the problems must be studied in development. Due regard must be paid to the concrete historical specifications of a problem. The class context must not be ignored. The priority of matter to thought must not be forgotten. This method Engels called 'Historical Materialism' or Materialistic conception of History'. Marx called it 'a materialistic and scientific method'³². The study and adoption of this method is important. It is a weapon in our daily struggles against the system in which we live.

Liberty

The first requisite for philosophising is a free and a fearless mind. It is not enough but academic and political freedom is also essential. We do not demand freedom because it is an angel but because it is a necessity. Freedom is recognition of necessity; we want freedom for pursuit of studies but our academic freedom is inseparable from political freedom. Concerning liberty, De Toequeville wrote: "I regard liberty as I have always done as the first of blessings; I see in it one of the most fruitful sources of manly virtue and great actions. I would never surrender it for tranquility or well-being. Yet I see that most of my contemporaries endeavour to accommodate themselves as well as possible to a very different regime and - what troubles and indeed horrifies my soul-would appear to make a readines for servitude, a part of virtue. I could not so think and feel even if I would. My nature revolts from it even more than my will. An indomitable instinct constrains me to be as I have always been on this point"³³. We must not accomodate ourselves to this regime. We must accept liberties as concessions but we must demand liberty, because it is the first condition of growth. Voltaire spoke of liberties as privileges and exemptions presupposing general servitude. In this sense the Middle Ages knew liberties but not liberty. Our Congress was content with liberties, but today it is demanding liberty-independence. Let us line ourselves with this demand for liberty.

The Congress

Our Congress has now become a circus of first class somersaulters, eel-wrigglers. Ramgarh, Delhi, Poona and Bombay witnessed their clownic shows. It pandered to the vulgar tastes of our despotic regime. It bargained for over a year for nothing. It pretended it did not know the war aims of our ruling circles. It zig zagged through a sea of indecision till it found a metaphysical anchorage in Gandhi. It knows it can now sleep calmly. It

freed itself of the responsibility and thereby saved its face and now at last we have some struggle started. Gone is mass civil disobedience. Gone is individual civil disobedience of the pre-war type. And now an individual civil Disobedience of a special type is in progress. It is childish, foolish and ill-conceived as Sir Siva Swamy Iyer said. Internally the congress has become a bureaucracy. Wielding the big stick of discipline, maintaining an external facade of unity, it is digging its own grave.

With all its shortcomings, we will support the Congress, especially in its campaign for civil liberties. Nothing is nearer to us than this cause. Chamberlain said that the British set out to fight what appear to them evil things - "brute force, bad faith, injustice, oppression and persecution." We on this side are fighting the same things, symbols of British Rule in India. Like the students in Bengal, demonstrate your solidarity with the Congress, the workers, the peasants and other progressive sections and masses. In this way, will we fight 'brute force, bad faith, injustice, oppression and persecution.

U.S.S.R.

We will now pass to a country where there are no economic crises that lead to war, to a country where students have no specific problems of struggles for freedom of speech, where there are no city problems as we have here, like begging, labourers who draw cart loads and ricksha-wallahs, where Marxism is put in practice over one-sixth of the globe, where there is Peace, Freedom and Progress. That country is U.S.S.R. Study it. Defend its policy, its institutions, its ideas, its giant leaders 'Lenin and Stalin.'

For liberty of speech with the Congress!

For solidarity with the workers and peasants!

For release of political prisoners!

For peace, progress and freedom!

References and Notes :

1. of Beveridge. 'Peace by Federation' op cit P 162 'The conflict today is limited and may remain limited'. (This was said in the winter of 1939)
2. As described by the President of the Board of Trade. See E.H. Carr 'Britain - A Study of Foreign Policy from the Versailles treaty to the break of war' London 1939, P. 95.
3. Carr op. cit 'P. 94, For details of the new policy see Ibid pp. 95-96.
4. For further details of British oil policy, see Carr op cit, pp. 28-30.
5. Professor W.G.S. Adams "Rights and Values" in 'The Deeper Causes of War and its issues' - a collection of addresses at the British Institute of Philosophy by various people. Allen and Unwin, London 1940, P. 26.
6. Professor Gilbert Murray 'Herd Instinct for good and evil' in "The Deeper Causes of War" op. cit P.46.
7. Ibid P. 33.
8. Professor Ernest Barker 'The Problem of an Order of Europe' in 'The Deeper Causes of War' op cit p. 138.
9. The very Rev. W.R. Mathews 'The War and the Crisis for the Spirit of Man' in 'The Deeper Causes of War' op cit p. 76.
10. Ibid 7.
11. Lionel Robbins 'The Economic Causes of War'. Jonathan Cape. London 1939 PP, 32-39. Read also V. I. Lenin "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism" the recent edition with the added data.
12. Robbins op cit. p. 39.
13. op cit. P. 46-59 (See Staley 'War and the Private Investor')
14. Robbins op cit' P. 45.
15. H.P. Adams 'Karl Marx in His Earlier Writings' Allen and Unwin London 1940 P. 210.
16. Marquis of Condorcet 'The life of Turgot' Dedication P. IV.
17. Marx 'Poverty of Philosophy' P-119.
18. Marx 'Thesis on Feurbach' (Thesis 2) in Karl Marx Selected works Vol. I P. 471. You will find this also in the appendix to 'Ludwing Feurbach' by Engels.
19. P. 3
20. See Marx 'Capital' (Eden & Cedar Paul) pp. 222-228.
21. Eric Roll 'A History of Economic Thought' P. 341.
22. J.P. Mayer "Prophet of the Mass Age - a study of Alexis De Tocqueville" Dent, London 1939 P. 138.
23. Quoted in Berlin op cit P. 115.
24. J. Stalin, concluding speech at Plenum of CC. of C.P.S.U. on March 5, 1937 (Moscow News April 7, 1937) P. 6. For liberal views on the interdependence of politics and Economics see Paul Van - Zeeland "Economics or politics - a lecture on the present problems of international relations" Cambridge 1939 P. 16
25. Viscount Samuel "Serving and reaping" in 'The deeper causes of war' op cit p. 58.
26. Adams op cit P. 73.
27. M.M. Postan 'The historical method in social Science, Cambridge. 1939 P. 15. For abstract treatment of Economics see. pp. 15-25.
28. Ibid P. 24.
29. Engles "Anti-Duhring" pp. 46-47.
30. H.P. Adams op cit P. 45.
31. Ibid P. 26.
32. Quoted in C.J.S. Spridge 'Karl Marx' Duckworth, London 1939 p. 138.
33. See Marx 'Capital' pp. 870-4, for the method employed by him in the work. See also Marx 'Critique of Political Economy - Preface' in which he set forth the materialist foundation of his method.
34. J.P. Mayer op cit. P. 126.

SIR BARNARD PARES, THE COMINTERN AND STALIN

COMMUNISM DISPLACED BY STATE CAPITALISM

BERNARD PARES ON STALIN'S POLICY

CHICAGO, June 7.

Sir Bernard Pares of London University in a discussion on "The Death of the Comintern" said the abandonment of "the dead horse" was important "because the spectre of world revolution was always in the way of Allied relations in their execution of war." He emphasised that a regime of State Capitalism had displaced Communism in Russia and pointed out that Stalin had proved his interest lay in developing his own country rather than in stringing up world revolution. He cited three opportunities of which M. Stalin failed to take advantage viz., conditions in Germany in 1923, England in 1925 and China in 1927.

- Reuter.

I

Strange it is, that Sir Bernard Pares should say such nonsense on the Comintern and Stalin at Chicago on 7th June 43, as reported in the "*Hindu*" of 8th June 43. Pares is a Professor of Slavic studies at the London University, has written some books on Russia, edited Russian Information Bulletins, and played an important role in bringing an understanding between the British and the Soviet people. Since 1941 he has been promoting accord between the two great peoples and his short history of Russia, though far from perfect, is a compact liberal presentation of a great ally of the United Nations.

SIR BARNARD PARES, THE COMINTERN AND STALIN

COMMUNISM DISPLACED BY STATE CAPITALISM

BERNARD PARES ON STALIN'S POLICY

But in his speech at Chicago (if the report is correct) he has gone back to his old prejudices.

When the presidium of the Communist International voted for its dissolution, the Comintern was by no means 'a dead horse'. Born in 1919, it was still growing, when the world conditions since 1941 made it necessary for the leaders to vote for its dissolution. It did not prolong its existence, like the Second International after it has rendered historical services. It did not permit itself to be rendered by divisions and internecine strife, as the First International which had migrated to U.S.A. and breathed its last. It did not wish like European Social Democracy to become a putrid corpse. In a word, live to the situation, it refused to be any obsolete institution and voted gracefully for its own disbandment. It is in the full plenitude of its power, in full consciousness of its splendor and majesty, when as Pares himself says "the specter of world revolution was always in the way of ached relations in their execution of war" that it voted for its dissolution.

The Presidium and Stalin have made it clear why they had to do so. What are the world conditions that led the Comintern to take such a step? They are the state of affairs created by the present war.

During the imperialist phase of the war 1939-41, the 'Red Bogey' propaganda was at its height from Chamberlain to Goebbels. The Communist Parties of the various Countries had to bear the odium that they had sold themselves to Moscow and at its instigation were fomenting trouble in their respective countries by insisting on the formula of peace and people's government. The Red Bogey was there in all countries in different forms even before the war. But during the period of the war it got intensified.

During the phase of the peoples war since 1941, while the governments of the various countries were delighted at the cooperation of the Communists and the Comintern. They were suspicious of them. But this

did not manifest itself until recently, when, as Stalin said in his May Day speech, the crisis in the Hitlerite camp is imminent. No doubt the crisis is there. No doubt the staggering success of the Russians at Stalinograd still further roused the dormant suspicions. The fear in the allied minds is what will be the fate of Europe, if Hitler collapses, and if Russia succeeded? Will there be Red revolutions? What will the Comintern do? Such are the vague fears that agitate the minds of the allies. Pares spoke truly. The fear was there always and now in view of the imminence of the crisis that Stalin spoke of that fear is further encouraged.

It is the same fear that led the democratic powers before the war to let Hitler rise to power, rather than see an European or an Asiatic revolution which may swallow them up. That fear led them to war. Today the same old fear, in a different form, is asserting itself. The presidium saw this wisely. Rather than create difficulties for Russia and the allies when the allied opinion is of such a character it voted for its dissolution. To day the question is to bring war to a finish. If the allies have some misunderstanding about the Comintern, why let it stand in the way? You must find the masses (here the allies and their masses) as they are and not as you like them to be. So wrote Marx to Kugelmann. The presidium gives other reasons :

"Deep differences in the historic paths of development in various countries of the world differences of character and even of contradictions in their social orders, differences in the level and tempo of their economic and political development and finally differences in the degree of consciousness and organization of their workers, conditioned the different problems which faced the working class in each country. The entire course of events in the past quarter of a century as well as the accumulated experiences of the Comintern have convincingly shown that the organizational form for uniting workers chosen by the First Congress of the Comintern and which corresponded to needs of the initial period of the rebirth of the working

class movement has more and more become outgrown by movements and developments by the increasing complexity of its problems in the separate countries and even become a hindrance to a further strengthening of the national working class parties.

“Proceeding from the above stated considerations and taking into account the growth in political maturity of communist parties and their leading cadres in individual countries and also having in view the fact that during the present war a number of sections have raised the question of the dissolution of the Comintern as a guiding centre of the International Labour movement the presidium of E.C.C.I unable to convene congress.” proposed to dissolve the Comintern”.

“Pravda” further explains : “It became clear that, as internal as well as international conditions grew more complex, the task of the workers movement in each country would meet insurmountable difficulties. The world war instigated by Hitler further accentuated the differences in the situation of different countries laying deep barriers between the countries which fell to Hitlerite tyranny and peace - loving countries which united into a powerful anti-Hitlerite coalition.”

In all the occupied countries we see national liberation movements springing up on the side of Hitler, the Red bogey is revived, to the effect that these movements are Moscow inspired. On the side of the liberal democratic capitalist powers, the fear how these movements end and how the Comintern directs these movements is revived. Assailed by the fascists and suspected by the several capitalist powers, the nationals of the various occupied countries find it difficult to get along with the organisation of the movements. The sequel is the disbandment of the Comintern. The nationals are now free to organise their own movements.

The Communist Parties of the Russian Countries will continue to base their policies on Marxism as expounded by the great teachers Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. The Soviet Union will continue to build socialism

till it reaches its goal Communism within its boundaries as much as possible under world conditions when capitalism still exists outside her boundaries. She will continue her policy of non-interference in internal affairs of other countries. She will continue to giving support to all peoples struggling for freedom.

Under these conditions, the departure of the Comintern, is not the departure of a dead horse but the affirmation of what it stands for in a national form. Stalin made it clear :

“The dissolution of the Communist International is proper and timely because it facilitates the organisation of the common onslaught of all freedom loving nations against the common enemy Hitlerism. The dissolution is proper because : it exposes the lie of Hitlerites to the effect that “Mascow” allegedly intends to intervene in the life of other nations and to ‘Bolshevisé’ them : it exposes the calumny of the adversaries of communism within the labour movement to the effect that communist parties in various countries are allegedly acting not in the interests of their people but on orders from outside : it facilitates the work of patriots in freedom loving countries for uniting the progressive forces of their respective countries regardless of party or religious faith into a single camp of national liberation - for the unfolding struggle against fascism. It facilitates the work of patriots of all countries for uniting all freedom loving peoples into a single international camp for the fight against the menace of world domination by Hitlerism, clearing the way to future organisation of a companionship of nations based upon their equality...”

It is clear, it is not the dead horse that is abandoned but the living one that resolved into its national forms.

II

Pares continues the indiscretion. He says : “State capitalism had displaced communism in Russia”. Whoever said that communism existed in Russia? Even up to the out break of the war, neither Stalin, nor

any one, has said that communism existed in U.S.S.R. The Soviet people have been achieving socialism with a view to establish communism. The Marxists have a definite meaning of communism. The theory has been stated clearly in the "Critique of the Gotha Programme" and "The State and Revolution" by Marx and Lenin respectively. It is a pity that such a student of Soviet affairs as Pares should overlook this point.

In the "Critique of the Gotha Programme" Marx distinguishes two phases of communist society : the lower and the higher, clearly, precisely and exactly. 'The first phase is when it has just emerged after prolonged birth pangs from capitalist society' is Socialism. In the other phase of society, the principle from each according to his ability to such according to his needs' obtains. When is this possible? When the antagonism between mental and physical labour has disappeared, when labour has become the prime necessity of life i.e., when there is no compulsion whatever, when the productive forces have grown considerably. (See Indian Edition pp 18-19 Lenin's notes on it in his note book Marxism on the State 1917 : pp 102-104) This phase of society is called communism. Marx stated it in 1875. Lenin discussed it in his notes in 1917. Again he discussed it in his 'State and Revolution' 1917 (See Ibid pp 126-140). In December 1919, he stated it even in more explicit terms.

"It we ever to ask ourselves in what way communism differs from socialism we would have to reply that socialism is the society which grows directly out of capitalism that it is the first form of new society. Communism on the other hand is a higher form of society, which can develop only when socialism has taken firm hold. Socialism implies the performance of work without the aid of capitalist, it implies social labour accompanied by the strictest accounting, control and supervision on the part of the organized vanguard, the most advanced section of the toilers. Moreover it emphasizes that standards of labour and the amount of compensation for labour must be determined. They must be determined because capitalist

society has left us such relics and habits as uncoordinated labour, lack of confidence in social economy, the old habits of the small producer which prevail in all present countries. All these run counter to a real communist economy. Communism on the other hand, is the name we apply to a system under which people become accustomed to the performance of public duties without any specific machinery of compulsion, when unpaid work for the common good becomes the general phenomenon." (Lenin C.W. Vol VIII. p 239 in critique pp 19-20).

The distinction between Socialism and Communism is clear in Marxism. What actually obtains in U.S.S.R. is not Communism but socialism on the way to Communism. At present, the workers are paid according to their skill and out-put. Labour is still compulsory. The distinction between mental and physical labour still prevails. Productivity is yet to be increased. Under these circumstances, in the Stalin constitution, it is not the formula of Saint Simon : "From each according to his ability to each according to his needs" that is inscribed but the formula of Stalin "to each according to his work."

The transition from socialism to communism is being foreseen and prepared for by Stalin. At the All Union conference of Stakhanovites held in Nov. 1935. Stalin said : "The significance of the Stakhanov Movement lies also in the fact that it is preparing the conditions for the transition from socialism to communism that it contains the seed. of the future in the cultural and technical level of the working class, that it opens to the path by which alone can be achieved those high indices of productivity of labour which are essential for the transition from socialism to communism and for the elimination of the distinction between mental and manual labour". ("Stalin" Kalinin pp 139-140)

In the report of the central committee to the 18th congress of the party in March 1939 Stalin outlined a practical program for the transition from the 1st phase of communism to the second. He said, "only if we

outstrip the principal capitalist countries economically can we reckon upon our country being fully saturated with consumer goods, on having an abundance of products, and on being able to make the transition from the 1st phase of communism to its second phase". (Kalinin - Stalin pp.142-3)

When the facts are so clear concerning the theory and practice of communism and socialism in U.S.S.R., Bernard Pares is surely wrong in saying that state capitalism had displaced communism.

Perhaps Pares was referring to war communism which has been replaced by New Economic Policy, known State Capitalism. War communism is the product of civil war and blockade. To combat these two evils, there was no other way left but a resort to strictest control and socialisation. Civil war crippled the Russian industry. Imports from the advanced European States had fallen to a zero and caused a terrible shortage of manufactured goods.. The peasantry found itself unable to obtain the consumer goods it normally expected in return for the surplus produce of its land. The surplus appropriation system forced the peasantry to produce enough to meet its own needs. This hardened the development of the productive forces in the countryside. The gap between the town and the country became wide.

With the cessation of the civil war, was found a need for a new economic policy. Concerning war communism Lenin said : "We have made the mistake of thinking we could pass straight to socialism without transition". The New Economic Policy is the policy pursued during this period of transition known as state capitalism.

State capitalism has a definite meaning in Marxist literature. Lenin had referred to this as a composite system "in which there is large scale socialist economy, private capitalist economy and state enterprises temporarily barred to private capital". He also referred to it as the system when small scale enterprise exists quite independent of the state enterprises". In answer to the question. "What is state capitalism"? he said : "It

is the unification of small scale production". (Dobb : "Soviet Economy and war. p 9) The New Economic policy permitted small scale production in the country, so that with the surplus, the peasantry could purchase manufactured goods. The gap between the town and country, during the period of transition, was reduced by this return to small scale production.

Lenin further defends the view that "Socialism is nothing else than the next step forward from the stage of monopolistic state capitalism. Or alternatively : socialism is nothing else than a capitalistic state monopoly worked in the interests of the whole nation and therefore no longer a capitalist monopoly". In 1920 Lenin wrote :

"In Russia we are experiencing the first stage in the change over from capitalism to socialism or to the soviet type of Communism. Class distinctions still exist and will continue to exist for years after the proletariat has achieved power. The destruction of class distinctions implies not only the abolition of the land owner and the capitalist ... but also that of small producers who cannot either be destroyed or suppressed, and with whom one must make a compromise. This they can and must be changed and educated up to new ideas carefully and slowly."

The New Economic policy was exactly the expression of this - a patient education of the peasantry in new ideas during the transition period.

Again in 1920 Lenin wrote :

"To attempt today to anticipate the achievements of a perfected and mature communism is like attempting to teach higher mathematics to a four year old child. We can and must begin to build up the edifice of socialism with the materials left to us by capitalism and not with some human compound that is our own special discovery."

In Sept. 1917 in "The Threatening Catastrophe and How to fight it" Lenin wrote : "State - monopoly capitalism is the fullest material preparation for socialism, it is its threshold, it is that rung on the historical ladder

between which and the rung called socialism there are no intervening rungs". "Socialism inconceivable without large scale capitalist technique on the last word modern science" again wrote Lenin in 1918 in *Left Wing childish ness and petty Bourgeois Mentality*".

From all these, it is clear that state capitalism is growing socialism. It is the habit of bourgeois writers that they use the word 'State' in general, without taking into account the actual class nature of the state at a given time. State capitalism means extension of capitalism under the auspices of a Soviet State, not of a capitalist state, which gets transformed into socialism in course of time. Socialism is inconceivable with out planned state organisation. To which ever period Pares was referring, whether to the period of war communism, or to the present, he is wrong. There has been no communism replaced but socialism has gradually grown out of capitalism under the aegis of the Soviet State towards a Communist Stage.

III

Strange again that Pares should say that Stalin has given up world revolution and pursued a national policy in U.S.S.R. So much has been written and said about it. But the prejudice still continues. It is not in the power of Stalin to make a world revolution even if he wills it. Revolutions arise out of circumstances in each particular country affected for good or bad, no doubt, by external circumstances. They cannot be ordered. Nor can they be dated. Neither can they be exported nor imported. If the ultimate aim of the Communists is world Communism, it does not mean that they desire a world revolution at one time. If that is the case it will be substituting revolutionary will to a given situation without taking into account the peculiarities in each country and the pre-requisite for such an event. It also depends on what kind of a revolution it is.

In order to make this point clear, it is necessary to study the historical context of the phrase 'world revolution'. Lenin in his article "The Attitude of Social Democracy Towards the Peasant Movement" wrote in 1905:

"We shall with all our might help the whole peasantry to make the democratic revolution in order that it may be easier for us, the party of the proletariat to pass on as quickly as possible to the new and higher task - the socialist revolution".

Lenin arrived at this idea in 1905 itself. But the Trotskyists and others maintain that he came to it after the war in 1916. Stalin as early as 1925 refuted Trotsky in opposition to Lenin's theory, advanced the theory of world revolution. Stalin refuted it (in his 1924 "Leninism" Vol.II. pp 37-38). The ideas of the Trotskyist group are : They did not understand the important role of the peasantry in the Russian revolution. They underestimated the revolutionary energy of the peasantry. They underestimated the strength and capacity of the Russian Proletariat to lead the peasantry. They wanted to begin at once by establishing the power of the proletariat, 'skipping over the necessary democratic phase of the revolution (Stalin). According to Lenin the revolution draws its forces chiefly from among the workers and peasants of Russia itself. According to the Trotskyists, the necessary forces can be found only "in the arena of the world proletarian revolution". (Stalin, October Revolution pp. 102-3). They forecasted that, as a consequence of the inevitable conflict between the proletarian state and peasantry, including the poor and middle peasants, the dictatorship of the proletariat must perish unless it is "supported by the state aid of the victorious proletariat of the West."

To these ideas of Trotsky and his group, Lenin and Stalin advanced the following ideas. Russia must pass through a bourgeois democratic phase of the Revolution before a proletarian revolution. It is a necessary one. The entire peasantry must be taken with the proletariat in the democratic revolution. They support the revolution because it is for democracy. The peasant's revolution is a revolution for democracy. The worker's revolution is for socialism. Therefore it is not necessary to depend on outside forces. The forces are in the country. The workers and peasants. These

ideas of Lenin and Stalin triumphed. They were confirmed by practice.

Russia passed through a bourgeois democratic revolution. Six months later, a proletarian revolution took place. Simultaneously revolutions broke out in Hungary, Bavaria, Germany, Italy but they were shortlived. The Russian revolution alone survived. Lenin and Stalin were right. Russia achieved the revolution without being dependent upon outside forces. But this is not to deny the goodwill of the international proletariat, particularly the British, during the period of the civil war and the blockade.

It is in this historical context that we have to understand the phrase world revolution. There was no question of giving up world revolution but this idea of Trotsky and others was fought tooth and nail by Lenin and Stalin.

This historical point got mixed up with the idea that Communists are for revolution all over the world, irrespective of historical considerations. Since their aim is world communism, it is alleged that the Communists particularly the Comintern would stir up a world revolution. When practice in U.S.S.R. confirmed the correctness of the ideas of Lenin and Stalin, how could the Communists and the Comintern cherish the idea of world revolution? How could they give it up when they did not have that idea?

It is true that during the period of the struggle for Brest Litovsk Treaty, that idea came up for discussion. But it was given up.

This point can be disposed of by Stalin's famous words in his interview with Howard :

"We never had any such idea (of fostering revolution). Export of revolution is nonsense. Each country, if it so desires, will make its own revolution, without such desire there will no revolution. If you think the Soviet Union has any desire to alter by force the social systems of the surrounding states you are sadly mistaken."

Howard : "A tragic misunderstanding"

Stalin : "Not tragic so much as tragi-comic."

He quoted Robespierre : "The wildest idea than can enter the head of any politician is to think that it is sufficient for a nation to carry its arms among other nations to make them adopt its own laws and constitution. No one loves armed missionaries."

Stalin repeated this idea in 1941 in his radio speech that revolution cannot be exported :

Now to come to the 'so-called national policy of U.S.S.R'. Having given up world revolution, it is pursuing a national policy. It is using the Comintern for such purposes. Such is the chorus of enemies. But the facts are there. Trotsky, from his theory of world revolution, has deduced at a later stage, the theory that socialism cannot be built in one single country. But Lenin and Stalin basing themselves on the law of uneven development of capitalism, advanced the idea that socialism can be built in one country with the forces in the country. But it is full of difficulties. Nonetheless it can be built. But it was stated clearly by Stalin at the 14th party Congress : "Building socialism in the U.S.S.R. will further the cause of the proletarians in all countries, it will hammer out the victory over capital not only in the U.S.S.R. but in the capitalist countries as well, for the revolution in the U.S.S.R. is part and parcel of the world revolution, the beginning and foundation of its development." (Kalinin - Stalin p. 107)

He also realised the difficulties of building socialism in one country, encircled by a ring of capitalist states. He said : "The building of our economic system must take place not only in the conflict between it and the capitalist system outside, but also in the conflict between the different elements inside our country, the conflict between the socialist elements and the capitalist elements."

In practice it has been proved that socialism can be built in a single country.

From this, a conclusion is drawn that U.S.S.R. has been pursuing a purely selfish national policy and using the Comintern for such purposes.

The foreign policy of the Soviet Union has been clear, not to interfere with the internal affairs of other countries, but to defend every inch of its territory, if coveted by the capitalist neighbours. As proof of neighbourly relations with the other countries, U.S.S.R. has inaugurated pacts of non-aggression, joined the League of Nations and became the ardent defender of collective security.

While the Comintern, which is separate from the U.S.S.R. played a great role in organising the world progressive forces since 1935 against the menace all of fascism. The United Nations today cannot but acknowledge the mighty role played by the Comintern in organising a world front of people against fascism. Surely this is not using the Comintern for national purposes. Stalin again made it clear in his speech to the 18th Party Congress in March 1939. He wishes to continue the policy of peace and of strengthening business relations with all countries. He wishes to strengthen the international bonds of friendship with the working people of all countries who are interested in peace and friendship among nations. He wishes to help the people struggling for freedom. Again he said in 1942 (Radio speech) : "Our war for the freedom of our country will merge with the struggle of the peoples of Europe and America for their independence, for democratic liberties."

Again both U.S.S.R. and the Comintern have helped democratic Spain, China, defended Abyssinia and organised the International Brigades who fought bravely against international fascism. It is clear that both U.S.S.R. and the Comintern have not pursued a selfish and national policy. The perspectives of the policy and the theories behind the policy have been misunderstood.

IV

As proof of the allegation that U.S.S.R. has abandoned world revolution and is pursuing a national policy, Pares cited "three opportunities of

which Mr. Stalin failed to take advantage, viz, conditions in Germany in 1923, England in 1925, and China in 1927.

It must be remembered that the government of U.S.S.R. is different from the Comintern. It must also be remembered that in three years between 1923-27. Stalin was only the General Secretary of the Russian Communist Party. Neither Stalin nor U.S.S.R. could take advantage of the events in those countries at any time, let alone during the period of 1923-7. They, being true internationalists, would no doubt be interested in the events. But they could not be "armed missionaries". It is the same with the Comintern.

The Communist parties of the countries mentioned as the only ones who could be held responsible for the events in their own countries especially those which could be traced to their policies. The Communist International, in laying down a general policy, always stresses on the national sections to taking special care in applying the policies in accordance with the local specific, peculiar characteristics. The Communist International does not invent any new policies. It generalises the experience of the international proletariat through the discussions of the best representatives of the working class of the various sections. That generalisation is to be applied in accordance with the local situation as a guide to action. Therefore the national communist parties and the ones which have to take interest in the events and take advantage of them if it furthers general interests of the society in general and the proletarians interests in particular. U.S.S.R., Stalin and the Comintern cannot take advantage of the events abroad, however much they wish. But they take advantage of them in drawing lessons from their failures or successes as a guide for their own actions, as true internationalists. They cannot take advantage of them in any manner. The will is there, but those responsible for the events in national countries, are the men on the spot.

In Germany in 1923, there was a revolutionary situation. But why did

not the revolutionary situation develop into a revolution? Did the German Communist party make a mistake? Did it fail to seize hold of the situation with correct strategy or tactics? How far should the German social democracy take responsibility for this? I remember Piatnisky analysed the situation in Germany at this time (I have not got the document here). No doubt the German Communist party made a mistake. It did not display proper initiative in leadership. Social democracy also was responsible. Having come to power in 1919, it became dizzy. It was evolutionary not revolutionary. Its organisation was bureaucratic. The very strength of the organisation paralysed it. It became gross and stodgy. It was content with defence. It gave up attack. It feared a Communist revolution. It lacked a leader, a great man, a political genius. It lacked a theoretician, a man of action.

In England, the general strike was called for without any preparations on the part of the labour leaders. The success of the strike paralysed them more than the ruling class. No political direction was given to the strike. A strike was called. It came. It staggered the leaders. The responsibility for the failure of the strike is to be placed on the Labour Party. The labour leaders made a joke of a great weapon of the working class. They have never been socialists (Cole). They could not take a strike seriously. They made a toy of it.

In China, the revolution of 1924-27 proved once again the historic law that the bourgeoisie would go with the other classes in so far as it helps them. But when they find that it is inconvenient for them to go further they discard the alliance. It again proved the truth of the law laid down by Marx, Engels, Lenin that the Communists must be with the bourgeoisie in accomplishing or completing the bourgeois democratic revolution. During the period of the alliance of the Communists and the nationalists, the democratic revolution was furthered the workers movement was growing. It was the growth of the workers movement that made the Chinese bourgeoisie

turn against the Communists. The Communists went out of the alliance and organised their independent work for this, the Notskeyises and others saw the betrayal of a revolution. But in reality the steps taken by the Chinese Communists in allying with Chang Kai Chek were correct. When Chang Kai-Chek turned butcher, the steps taken by the Communists were also correct. To day once again the Communists and the nationalists are in the forefront of the struggle, united against fascism as never before.

To conclude, on all these four points Sir Bernard Pares is wrong. When men like Pares who made some study of Russia make mistakes of this kind, we can imagine what more will be committed, if attempted by lesser men than Pares.

MARXSIM AND CLASS ALLIANCES

Mankind takes up the problems that it can solve at a given moment through various classes and their struggles. In taking up such problems for solution, one particular class alone, however dominant and revolutionary it is, does not achieve it. It does in alliance with other classes. The class that is dominant and revolutionary, by virtue of its position, exercises hegemony over others. It leads the other classes in alliance for the solution of the problem.

In the modern (capitalist) world theoretically, the proletariat is the only consistent revolutionary class. But we have to note what it actually is at a given moment in the history of social development, judging from the standpoint of its consciousness and organisation. Marx and Engels wrote in the "Communist Manifesto" in 1848 :

"Of all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie today, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class. The other classes decay and finally disappear in the face of modern industry, the proletariat is its special and essential product."

As a theoretical statement - as a generalisation of historical experience it is correct. But when we take into account the developmental phases of the proletariat in each particular country we find in all stages of the class struggle of the proletariat the question of alliance with other classes cropping up.

At this time, Marx and Engels were concerned with problems of democracy. Mehring writes:

MARXISM AND CLASS ALLIANCES

“Die Nene Rhenische Zeitung appeared in the political arena as the organ of democracy. And although an unmistakably red thread ran through all its articles, it directly defended the interest of the bourgeois revolution against absolutism and feudalism more than the interests of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. You will find very little material in its columns about the separate labour movement during the revolution although one should not forget that along with it there appeared twice a week under the editorship of Moll and Schapper, a special organ of the Cologne labour league.

“Marx and Engels were historically and politically right when they thought that the working class was above all interested in pushing the bourgeois revolution as far as possible. Nevertheless, remarkable proof of how the elementary instinct of the labour movement is able to correct the conceptions of the most brilliant thinkers is provided by the fact that in April 1849, they expressed themselves in favour of a specific workers organisation and of participation in the labour Congress, which was being proposed by the East Elba (East Prussia) proletariat.”

Lenin agrees with the view of Mehring and he comments :

“Thus it was only in 1849 often the revolutionary newspaper had been published for almost a year (June 1848) that Marx and Engels declared themselves in favour of a special worker’s organisation. Until then they were merely running an “Organ of democracy” unconnected by any organisational ties with an independent worker’s party ...”. (Lenin S.W. Vol.III p. 131) Why? The proletarian features were less in evidence in the German democratic revolution because of the backwardness of Germany in 1848, backward in economic and political fields and the political disintegration of the country. Nevertheless a year after the German revolution of 1848, Marx drew the conclusion of the necessity for independent organisation of the working class party. (Lenin S.W. Vol. 3. p. 132.)

Theoretically, the position of the working class is one but actually its position at a given movement is another. Marx and Engels in 1848 made the correct theoretical statement concerning the working class. But actually at that time, they were concerned with problems of democracy, as the proletariat was just emerging. In 1849 they recognised the need for the working class organisation and the need for the working class to push forward the bourgeois revolution. As a matter of fact in 1848, they stated in the Communist Manifesto.

“As soon as the bourgeois revolution begins in Germany, the Communist party will make common cause with it against the absolute monarchy, the feudal landed proprietors and the lower middle class. At the same time the party will lose no opportunity for making apparent to the working class the enmity that exists between middle class and proletariat.”

Although the proletariat is the only revolutionary consistent class, the question of allies at a particular stage, in the course of the class struggle of the proletariat, has never been denied. It was stated clearly in the Manifesto in 1848.

This point has again been discussed by Marx in *'The Critique of the Gotha Programme'* in 1875. The programme had adopted a Lassalleian formula : “In contrast to the working class, all other classes form only one reactionary mass”. In reply to this, Marx quotes the sentence from the *'Communist Manifesto'* concerning the bourgeoisie and points out the historical role of the bourgeois at that given movement. A general statement about the bourgeois as a class in contrast to the proletariat is one thing but a statement concerning the specific, historical, concrete, developmental phases of the bourgeoisie, in contrast to the feudal and other classes is another. Marx wrote :

“The bourgeoisie is here conceived as a revolutionary class - as the bearer of large scale industry - in contrast to the feudal lords and middle estates, who desire to maintain all social positions that are the creation of

obsolete modes of production". Therefore, the bourgeois, cannot be lumped with the feudal lords as one reactionary mass.

Marx continues "On the other hand, the proletariat is revolutionary in contrast to the bourgeois because, having itself grown up on the basis of large scale industry, it strives to strip off from production the capitalist character that the bourgeois seeks to perpetuate."

But in relation to the feudal lords, the bourgeoisie and the workers have a common basis for alliance, as the destruction of feudalism is necessary for the free development of the bourgeois and the proletariat.

We must consider other classes also. In the '*Communist Manifesto*' it is stated :

"The lower middle class, the small manufacturer, the shopkeeper, the artisan, the peasant, all these fight against the bourgeoisie, to save from extinction their existence as fractions of the middle class. They are therefore not revolutionary but conservative. Nay, more they are reactionary, for they try to roll back the wheel of history. If by chance they are revolutionary, they are so only in view of their impending transfer into the proletariat; they thus defend not their present, but their future interests; they desert their own standpoint to place themselves at that of the proletariats..."

This statement is correct. It is amply borne out by subsequent history. These sections, on account of their position in society, vacillate now to this or that side and according to the situation, the proletariat allies itself with these sections as they ally themselves with the proletariat, when their interests demand so. Hence Marx writes that the middle class, "together with the bourgeoisie and with the feudal lords into the bargain," from only one reactionary mass" in relation to the working class," is nonsense. (Critique of Gotha programme : pp. 23-25)

Marx had in mind this question of the classes, their struggle and their alignments at different stages of development in the society. In *capital* Vol. I alone he has given 12 instances where classes whose interests are

diametrically opposite to those of others, entered into alliance for common purpose, and even expoused their cause.

Engels in his letter to Bebel (London March 18, 28 - 1875) criticised this thesis of Lassalle. He called it high sounding and unhistorical (Ibid. P 51) He says : "This statement is only true in a few exceptional cases : for instance, in a proletarian revolution like the Commune or in a country where not only have state and society been moulded by the bourgeoisie in its own image but where in its wake the democratic petty bourgeoisie too has already carried out this re-casting down to its final consequences. If in Germany, for instance, the democratic petty bourgeoisie belonged to this reactionary mass, how could the Social - Democratic Worker's Party have gone hand in hand with it - with the People's Party - for years? How can the Volkstaat (People's State) take almost the whole of its political contents from the petty bourgeoisie democratic Frankfurter Zeitung? And how comes it that no less than seven demands are accepted in this programme which directly and literally coincide with the programme of the People's Party and petty bourgeois democracy?" (P 51-3)

It is clear, that this phrase "One solid reactionary mass" is high sounding and unhistorical as used by Lassalle.

On this subject Engels wrote to Bernstein on Nov. 2, 1882 :

"The real weakness is the childish notion of the coming revolution which is supposed to begin with 'Guelfs here Ohebellines there', the whole world dividing itself into two armies : 'we' here, 'the one reactionary mass' there. That means that the revolution is to begin with the fifth act, and not with the first, in which the mass of all the oppositional parties stands together against the government and its blunders and thus is victorious, upon which the separate parties among the victors, one after another, wear themselves out, make themselves impossible, until finally this means the mass of the people, is thrust wholly on to our side and then Vollmar's much vaunted decisive battle can proceed" (p. 22-3)

In this passage we see the development of the struggle of the oppositional parties and their alignments against the govt. and its blunders from the 1st to the fifth act.

We now come to Lenin. In his discussions on the role of the proletariat and its allies in the coming bourgeoisie democratic revolution in Russia, this idea of Marx and Engels finds much prominence.

Innumerable instances wherein Lenin emphasised the need for alliance with the other classes according to circumstances could be mentioned. Concerning the attitude of Russian Social Democracy towards the provisional government, Lenin in his essay on the "1905 Revolution" wrote:-

"Some say that to take part in the Provisional Government together with bourgeois revolutionary democracy means giving our blessing to bourgeois society. Social democracy does not turn its back, on the struggle for political freedom on the ground that it is bourgeois political freedom. It gives its blessing to the democratic bourgeois order in comparison with the monarchical, serf holding bourgeois order. It praises it as the most suitable area for the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. It blesses it not for its police and prisons but for the sweeping and free struggle against these institutions. Of course participation in provisional government means some dangers for social democracy. There cannot be any form of struggle, any political situation which does not bring dangers with it. If the revolutionary class interest is lacking, then it is dangerous to participate in strikes. It may lead to economism or to take part in the parliamentary struggle. It may end in parliamentary idiocy. But it stands to reason that if Social Democracy even for a moment forgot the class separateness of the proletariat as against the lower bourgeoisie, or lost sight of its own independent aims and the necessity to concentrate its attention on developing the class consciousness of the proletariat and its independent political organisation - in that case, participation would be extremely dangerous."

The last two points are important. In any alliance, the class separatism of the proletariat as against other classes, and the need for developing the independent political organisation and its consciousness must not be lost sight of.

There again, the bourgeois democratic elements cannot be considered 'a reactionary mass in contrast to the workers'.

In "What is to be done?" Lenin hammers the same point.

"Are not Marxists then wrong in entering into alliance with such elements? (bourgeois democrats and legal Marxists.) We have self reliance. We cannot fear to enter into temporary alliances even with unreliable people. Combination with the 'legal Marxists' by Marxists got a rapid victory over Narodism and Marxian idea, though in a vulgarised form, became very wide spread. Essential condition for such an alliance is the liberty of the socialists to reveal to the working class that its interests are diametrically opposed to the bourgeoisie. He who is afraid of entering into alliance with others, however unreliable, lacks self confidence." Here Lenin emphasises one important point, namely, unity on the basis of struggle against the opposites it interests diametrically opposed of there entering unity. The bourgeoisie democrats and the legal Marxists in this context, cannot be called "a reactionary mass' in contrast to the workers class.

Lenin insisted on the idea that Russia has to pass through a bourgeoisie democratic phase of the revolution before it can achieve the proletarian one. In order to achieve the bourgeoisie democratic revolution, he advanced the idea of the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry. This simply means that the workers must take the entire peasantry with them in their struggle against autocracy, serfdom and privileges.

He wrote :

"One of the objections raised to the slogan" the revolutionary - democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry" is that

dictatorship presupposes a "united will" and that there can be no united will between the proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie. This objection is fallacious, for it is based on an abstract, 'metaphysical' interpretation of the term "united will". "Will" may be united in one respect and not united in another. The absence of unity on questions of socialism and the struggle for socialism does not prevent unity of will on questions of democracy and the struggle for a republic. To forget this would be tantamount to forgetting the logical and historical difference between a democratic revolution and a socialist revolution. To forget this would mean forgetting the national character of the democratic revolution : if it is "national" it means that there must be "unity of will" priority in so far as this revolution satisfies the national needs and requirements. Beyond the boundaries of democracy there can be no unity of will between the proletariat and the peasant bourgeoisie class struggle between them is inevitable".

Unity is in accordance with the specific requirement of the day. What is possible in one sphere (democracy) is not possible in the other (socialism). In the struggle against autocracy for a republic, the problem is one of democracy and unity is possible between the workers and the entire section of the peasantry. Therefore the peasantry cannot be regarded in this context, as one reactionary mass in contrast to the working class.

Lenin in his article "Discussion on Self Determination Summed Up" wrote :

"To imagine that social revolution is conceivable without revolts by small nations in the colonies and Europe, without the revolutionary outbursts of a section of the petty bourgeois with all its prejudices, without a movement of non-class conscious proletarian and semi-proletarian masses against the oppression of the landlords, the church, the monarchy, the foreign nations etc. - to imagine that means repudiating social revolution. Apparently they imagine that in one place an army, will line up and say, 'We are for socialism' and in another place another army will say, 'we are

for imperialism' and that this will be social revolution. Whoever expects 'pure' social revolution will never live to see it. Such a person pays lip service to revolution without understanding what revolution is. The Russian Revolution of 1905 was a bourgeois - democratic revolution. It consisted of a series of battles in which all the discontented classes, groups and elements of the population participated ... objectively the mass movement broke the back of Tsarism and paved the way for democracy; and for that reason the class conscious workers led it. The socialist revolution in Europe cannot be anything else than an out burst of mass struggle on the part of all and sundry of the oppressed and discontented elements" (Lenin S.W. Vol.V. pp 303-4)

In a revolution, various mixed elements get in. The question of "one reactionary mass" appears only in exceptional cases like counter-revolution against a successful revolution. But in general the solution of the problems is by means of unity with various classes on the basis of struggle but under the leadership of a class which happens to be consistent and revolutionary at a given time.

In Britain, the British working class allied itself with the middle class but soon got disillusioned. This gave a great impetus to the chartists movement. (See Max Beer "History of British Socialism") When it was necessary for the working class to ally itself with the middle class it did not hesitate to do so. It even helped the middle classes to win the reform Act of 1862. Hence we cannot say at this period, the middle classes are a solid reactionary mass in relation to the working class. By experience the British working class found the need for independent organisation and activity. Today the Communists in Britain have been fighting for unity with labour so that working class unity could be achieved and the war against fascism - the greatest enemy of the working class - could be brought to a victorious close.

Lenin contributed a great deal to the question of the alliance between

the British Labour Party and the Communists. Murphy relates a conversation between himself and Lenin :-

Lenin : "Can any organisation affiliated to it (the British Labour Party) or any other member criticise its leaders? Can they conduct their own propaganda".

"Yes" I (Murphy) answered.

Lenin : "Then the revolutionary socialists must go into it". (Murphy "New horizons" p. 130)

Lenin lays down two conditions namely freedom of criticism and freedom of propaganda to one's own organisation, for perfect unity.

Murphy continues :

"He (Lenin) expressed the view that the labour leaders should be helped to power not because they would introduce socialism but that they could then be more effectively exposed to the workers as incapable of bringing about socialism (p. 130)

Lenin described the tactic of the affiliation of the Communist Party to the Labour Party as the "Cooperation of the vanguard of the working class with the rear-guard". (p. 149)

Lenin in his brochure 'Left wing Communism' told us to support the labour leaders in the same way that a rope supports a man to be hanged. Jackson T.A. said, "We must take them by the hand as a preliminary to taking them by the throat." The devil of it was that we got thoroughly aggrieved when the labour leaders did not wait to shake hands but hit out at us instead". (Murphy p. 181)

We do not enter into alliance with other classes for splitting their skulls or shaking their hands. We enter into alliance for a specific social purpose and in the course of the alliance, the peculiarities of the constituents are revealed and the communists expose those peculiarities divergence between word and deed, to the masses. But the primary motive is to further the social cause, democracy, socialism, or whatever it is.

In his "Left wing Communism" Lenin urged again and again the Communists to participate even in reactionary trade unions and achieving unity. He even suggested the use of parliaments. No matter where you are and, carry the line of the Communist International, in so far as it can be carried taking into account the circumstances at each place.

We now come to Stalin. In his "October Revolution and the Middle Strata of the Population", Stalin emphasised once again the ideas of Lenin. In the first stage of the revolution, that is, the overthrow of Tsarism (militarist - feudal Capitalism) the proletariat will not regard the other classes as one reactionary mass. It will take into alliance, the middle classes, the intelligentsia and the whole of the peasantry. In the next stage, when the bourgeoisie is to be overthrown, the proletariat will differentiate between the peasantry, will ally itself with the poor section of the peasantry; When the bourgeois is overthrown, the proletariat in commencing its work of socialism, will neutralise the middle peasantry and wage struggle against the rich peasants (Kulaks) This is dependent upon the degree to which these sections of the peasantry are prepared for collectivisation in agriculture. The question of the allies of the proletariat is dependent upon the stages of its political tasks and hence the proletariat cannot talk of the other classes as one "reactionary mass".

Stalin made reference to the question of allies in the tactic of the class struggle of the proletariat, on July 3rd, 41. In defending the non-aggression pact with Germany; he said :

"One might ask how could it have happened that the Soviet concluded a Non-aggression pact with felons and monsters as Hitler and Ribbentrop. Had not the Soviet Committed a mistake? Of course not. A pact of Non-aggression is a pact of peace between two countries. It was such a pact that Germany offered as in 1939. Could the Soviet reject such an offer? I think no peace-loving country should reject agreement with a neighbouring

state, even if at the head of that state stand such monsters and cannibals as Hitler and Ribbentrop”.

Even today this question of the Non-aggression pact between Fascists (Germany) and Communists (U.S.S.R.) is misunderstood. Again when Churchill offered aid to U.S.S.R., Stalin accepted it. How can there be alliance between Imperialists and Communists? The question of the relation of class forces in the international arena at a given time and the alliances to which it leads is not a strange phenomenon. Only doctrinaires see in such alliances the danger of losing their caste. History has proved that their alliances, strange as they seem, have been a blessing to progressive mankind.

In the epoch of the offensive of Fascism, Dimitroff on behalf of the Communist International, stressed first the unity of the working class, within its own ranks. A united front of the working class is a pre-requisite for a wider unity of the progressive forces, the middle classes, the intelligentsia and the peasantry, a popular front, against fascism. This again paving the way for “world front of peoples against fascism. This is the message of the Communist International since the seventh world congress of 1935.

The Communist International familiarised the forgotten ideas of Engels. Manuilsky in his pamphlet on Engels, revived the ideas of Engels and showed how the workers should not regard other classes as one reactionary mass.

The Communist International, built the World Congress against war and fascism through Barbusse - an example of unity of the various classes affected by the crisis against fascism.

In France, in Spain, in China, best examples of united front and popular front could be seen. Fascism was averted in France. In Spain the democratic forces, fought against International fascism for three and half years. In China, the progressive forces are fighting against Japan for the last seven years.

We have considered the problem of unity from the standpoint of the working class, as in the modern epoch, that is the only class that can carry out such tasks according to its stages of development in each particular country in history. We find other classes also grappling with the problem of allies, without considering others as one reactionary mass. The bourgeoisie, in alliance with other classes, overthrew feudalism. 1789 is a good example.

It is the classes, their various stages of development in the society and their interests that determines form and content of unity. Marxism has no cast-iron rules concurring unity. Marxism is not a dogma but a guide to action. Lenin wrote :

"Unity is an advantage when it raises all those who are united to the level of the intelligent and resolute programme of the thing that unites.

"Unity is a dis-advantage when it degrades those who are united to the level of the prejudices of the masses." (Lenin S.W. Vol.II p. 219)

(This takes us to the question of masses and people:)

"The intelligent and resolute programme of the thing that unites" is the starting point. The classes and their relative position in society determine the thing, who is to lead, how, and in alliance with whom.

LAW OF COMBINED DEVELOPMENT

LAW OF COMBINED DEVELOPMENT

“Irregularity in economic and political development is an invariable law of Capitalism.”

- *Lenin Works*
(Russian Edition) Vol. XIII, p. 133

CONTENTS

- | | |
|--|-----|
| 1. Introduction | 132 |
| 2. "The Law of Combined Development" Applied to India. | 133 |

Introduction

This paper is written for the following reasons :

1. It is to serve as an antidote to those who talk of 'mechanical, schematic evolutionary process'. The drawback of such a notion is it does not take into account 'the skipping over stages' caused by the dialectics of 'backwardness' and 'development'.

2. It brings into relief the productional forces - technique and labour - power - upon which the relations of classes arise which generate of classes take place which foster antagonisms. It is a research into the origins of class struggles. The solution of problems of one class by another is the historic law of backwardness.

3. It is to maintain the thesis that the problem of minorities in India is at bottom a problem of nationalities and class-struggles - of unevenness, of backwardness and development. Both struggle and rise of higher forms of government. The principle of democratic centralism is such a form of government. National antagonisms seek a remedy in self determination, class struggles in Proletarian Revolution - which express the dialectics of federalism and centralism. National in form and proletarian in content is the social basis of democratic centralism.

4. It is written to prove that insistence on a certain level of productivity as a prerequisite for a revolution, is not the correct method of appraising the mission or content of a Revolution.

5. Lastly it is written to serve as a morphological prophecy of the inevitability of a series of revolutions in India, which are hastened by the law of combined development.

II

“The Law of Combined Development” Applied to India.

A backward country assimilates the material and intellectual conquests of the advanced countries. But this does not mean that it follows them slavishly, reproduces all the stages of their past. The theory of the repetition of historic cycles¹ rests upon an observation of the first experiments of capitalist development. A certain repetition of cultural stages in ever new settlements was in fact bound up with the provincial and episodic character of that whole process. Capitalism means, however, an overcoming of these conditions. It prepares and, in a certain sense, realizes the universality and permanence of man's development. By this a repetition of the forms of development by different nations is ruled out. Although compelled to follow after the advanced countries, a backward country does not take things in the same order. The privilege of historic backwardness - and such a privilege exists - permits, or rather compels, the adoption of whatever is ready in advance of any specified date, skipping a whole series of intermediate stages. Savages throw away their bows and arrows for rifles all at once, without travelling the road which lay between those two weapons in the past. The European colonists in America did not begin history all over again from the beginning. The fact that Germany and the United States have now economically outstripped England was made possible by the very backwardness of their capitalist development. On the other hand the Conservative anarchy in the British Coal industry is a paying-up for the past when England played too long the role of capitalist pathfinder. The development of historically backward nations leads necessarily to a peculiar combination of different stages in the historic process. Their development as a whole acquires a planless, complex, combined character.

The possibility of skipping over intermediate steps is of course by no means absolute. Its degree is determined in the long run by the economic

and cultural capacities of the country. The backward nation, moreover, not infrequently debases the achievements borrowed from outside in the process of adapting them to its own more primitive culture. In this the very process of assimilation acquires a self-contradictory character. Thus the introduction of certain elements of western technique and training, above all military and industrial, under Peter I in Russia, led to a strengthening of serfdom as the fundamental form of labor organization. European armament and European loans, both indubitable products of a higher culture, led to a strengthening of tsarism, which delayed in its turn the development of the country. It led to similar phenomena in India. It led to the strengthening of feudalism in Indian States, of orthodoxy in Arya Samaj, and Hindu Maha Jana Sabha. Again British investments led to the strengthening of imperialism which in its turn delayed the development of the country.

The laws of history have nothing in common with a pedantic schematism. Unevenness, the most general law of the historic process, reveals itself most sharply and complexly in the destiny of the backward countries. Under the whip of external necessity their backward culture is compelled to make leaps. From the universal law of un-evenness this derives another law which, Trotsky calls "the law of combined development."² By this we mean a drawing together of the different stages of the Journey, a combining of separate steps, an amalgam of archaic with more contemporary forms. Without this law, to be taken of course in its whole material content, it is impossible to understand the history of India, and indeed of any country of the second, third or tenth cultural class.

Under pressure from imperialism, the Indian State swallowed up a far greater relative part of the people's wealth and thereby not only condemned the people to a twofold poverty, but also weakened the foundations of the possessing classes. Being at the same time in need of support from the latter, it forced and regimented their growth.³ As a result the bureaucratized privileged classes never rose to their full height. The state approached

a despotism, with the help of the Indian nobility, they subdued the bourgeoisie, made the peasants and workers slaves, and built an imperial edifice at Simla. The backwardness of the whole process is sufficiently indicated in the fact that serfdom born in the Vedic period, took form in the Brahmanic period, flowered in the Moghul period is still juridically un-anulled in the British period. Religion played no small role in the formation of British autocracy. It played a servile role. It was satisfied with the role of spiritual servant of the autocracy and counted this as a recompense for its humility.

The meagreness of all the old Indian history finds its most depressing expression in the absence of real medieaval cities as centers of commerce and craft. Handicraft did not succeed in India in separating itself from agriculture, but preserved its character of home industry. The old Indian cities were commercial, administrative, military and manorial - centres of consumption, consequently not of production. Indian trade from time immemorial gave leadership to foreign commercial capital and imparting a semi-colonial character to the whole process. This kind of economic relation developed further during the epoch of Indian capitalism and found its extreme expression in the imperialist war.

The insignificance of Indian cities - also made impossible a reformation - a replacement of the feudal bureaucratic orthodoxy by some sort of modernized kind of religion adapted to the demands of a bourgeois society.

Yet all through the Indian history, there were peasant revolts. What was lacking in this menacing popular uprising in order to convert it into a revolution? A third estate. Without the industrial democracy of the cities, a peasant war could not develop into a revolution. The result of these revolts was just the opposite - a strengthening of bureaucratic absolutism as the guardian of the interests of the nobility.

The Europeanization of the country became during the last century and a half more and more a demand of the ruling class itself, the nobility. The aristocratic intelligentsia, generalizing this demand politically went to the point of a conspiracy to limit the powers of autocracy. Thus under pressure from European bourgeois development, the progressive nobility attempted to take the place of the lacking Third Estate. But it nevertheless wished to combine its liberal regime with the security of its own domination and therefore feared most of all to arouse the peasantry.

The landlords who owned factories were the first among their class to favor replacing serfdom by wage labor. The growing export of Indian grain gave an impulse in the same direction. The noble bureaucracy, relying upon the liberal landlords carried out its peasant reform. The important bourgeois liberalism during this operation played the role of humble chorus. It is needless to remark that imperialism solved the fundamental problem of India, the agrarian problem in a niggardly and thriving fashion. The solution of the problems of one class by another is one of those combined methods natural to backward countries.

The law of combined development reveals itself, most indubitably, in the history and character of Indian Industry. Arising late, Indian Industry did not repeat the development of the advanced countries, but inserted itself into this development, adapting their latest achievements to its own backwardness. Just as the economic evolution of India as whole skipped over the epoch of craft-guilds and manufacture, so also the separate branches of industry made a series of special leaps over technical productive stages that had been measured in the west by decades. Thanks to this, Indian industry developed in certain periods with extraordinary speed. It was the same in Russia. Between the first revolution and the war, industrial production in Russia approximately doubled. M.N. Pokrovsky thought that this was a sufficient basis for concluding that the legend of backwardness and slow growth is to be abandoned.⁴ One should be

careful of such a generalization. Although India today is one of the eight great industrial countries in the world, yet it is backward and its industrial development is low still in spite of its jumps.

The basic criterion of the economic level of a nation is the productivity of labor. This in its turn depends upon the relative weight of the industries in the general economy of the country. On the eve of the war, India obtained a relative degree of prosperity. National income per capita showed a tendency towards an increase in average income since the end of the nineteenth century which was most marked between 1900 and 1914.⁵ We must add that by 1900 the greater part of India's present railway system had been completed. Between 1900 and 1914 nearly 10,000 miles were added.⁶ Other comparative coefficients were of the same type.

But it is just in the sphere of economy that the law of combined development most forcibly emerges. Peasant land-cultivation as a whole remains at the level of the middle ages, while Indian industry in its technique and capitalist structure stands at the level of the advanced countries and in certain respects even tries to outstrip them, like the Tata Iron and steel Company. This does not disprove this backwardness but dialectically completes it.

The confluence of industrial with bank capital is also accomplished in India with a completeness. But the subjection of the industries to the banks means their subjection to the British money market. Heavy industry, metal, coal, oil - is almost wholly under the control of foreign finance capital; which has created for itself an auxiliary and intermediate system of banks in India. The only exception perhaps is the Tata Iron Company. Light industry is following the same road. Foreigners owned in general 40 percent of all the stock capital of India, but in the leading branches of industry, that percentage is still higher.⁷ We can say without exaggeration that the controlling shares of stock in the Indian banks, plants and factories were to be found abroad.

The social character of the Indian bourgeoisie and its political physiognomy are determined by the condition of origin and the structure of Indian industry. The extreme concentration of this industry alone means that between the capitalist leaders and the popular masses there is no hierarchy of transitional layers. To this we must add that the proprietors of the principal industrial, banking, and transport enterprises are foreigners, who realize on their investment not only the profits drawn from India, but also a political influence in Indian parliament and so not only do not forward the struggle for Indian Parliamentarism but often oppose it. Such are the elementary and irremovable causes of the political isolation and anti-popular character of the Indian bourgeoisie.⁸ Whereas in the dawn of its history it was too unripe to accomplish a reformation, when the time came for leading a revolution it was overripe.

In correspondence with this general course of development of the country, the reservoir from which the Indian working class formed itself was not the craft-guild, but agriculture, not the city, but the country. Moreover, in India the proletariat did not arise gradually through the ages, carrying with itself the burden of the past as in England, but in leaps involving sharp changes of environment, ties relations, and a sharp break with the past. It is just this fact - combined with the concentrated oppression of British Imperialism - that makes the Indian workers hospitable to the boldest conclusions of revolutionary thought - just as the backward industries are hospitable to the last word in capitalist organization.

The Indian proletariat is for ever repeating the short history of its origin. While in the metal industry, especially in Bombay, a layer of hereditary proletarians was crystallized out, having made a complete break with the country, in the other provinces, the prevailing type is half-proletarian, half peasant. A yearly inflow of fresh labour forces from the country in all the industrial districts kept renewing the bonds of the proletariat with its fundamental social reservoir.

The incapacity of the bourgeoisie for political action is immediately caused by its relation to the proletariat and the peasantry. It could not lead after its workers who stand hostile in their every day life, and have so early learned to generalize their problems. But it is likewise incapable of leading after it the peasantry, because it is entangled in a web of interests with the landlords, and dread a shake-up of property relations in any form. The advent of the Indian Revolution is not only a matter of chronology but also of the social structure of the nation.

England achieved her Puritan revolution when her whole population was not more than five and half millions, of whom half a million were to be found in London. France, in the epoch of her revolution, had in Paris also only half a million out of a population of twenty-five million. Russia at the beginning of the twentieth century had a population of about 150 million, of whom more than three millions were in Petrograd and Moscow. Behind these comparative figures lurk enormous social differences. Not only England of the seventeenth century, but also France of the eighteenth, had no proletariat in the modern sense. In Russia, however, the working class in all branches of labor, both city and village numbered in 1905 no less than ten million, which with their families amounts to more than twenty-five million-that is to say, more than the whole population of France in the epoch of the great revolution. Advancing from the sturdy artisans and independent peasants of the army of cromwell - through the Sansculottes of Paris - to the industrial proletarians of St. Petersburg, the Revolution had deeply changed its social mechanism, its methods and there-with its aims.

India will achieve her first revolution with her population of 360 million. In 1922 India obtained recognition by the League of Nations as one of the eight chief industrial states in the world. The grounds on which this claim was based are stated in the Memorandum prepared by the India Office. This memorandum gave the following figures to illustrate the industrial importance of the country -

“28,000,000 agricultural workers (excluding peasant proprietors); 141,000 maritime workers, lascars etc, a figure secondary to that for the United Kingdom; over 20,000,000 workers in industries; including cottage industries, mines and transport; railway mileage in excess of that in every country except the United States.”

It is impossible to say how far and to what extent the figures given above hold good today. The railways of India alone offer employment to very nearly a million workers. The number of workers employed in plantations according to 1921 census amounted to over three quarters of a million. The numbers employed in factories are 1,520,315⁹ It is with the hegemony of this industrial proletariat that India is going to produce her first revolution.

The present decade of Gandhism is a prologue to the inevitable revolutions that are going to occur in direct succession. In the prologue, all the elements of the drama are included. The imperialist war made British and Indian autocracy totter. Against the background of a mass movement, the liberal bourgeoisie frightened and still frighten the autocracy with its opposition. The workers have organized independently of the bourgeoisie, and in opposition to it, in unions a form of organization is called into being. Peasant uprisings to seize the land occurred throughout the vast stretches of the country. There is discontent both in the army and police. The Indian civil service is not without its grievances. All the revolutionary forces are then going into action for the first time lacking experience and confidence. The liberals demonstratively back away from the revolution exactly at the moment when it becomes clear that to shake up autocracy will not be enough, and that it must be overthrown. This sharp break of the bourgeoisie with the people, in which the bourgeoisie carry with it considerable circles of the democratic intelligentsia, make it easier for imperialism to differentiate within the groups and to make a bloody settlement with the

workers and peasants. Imperialism will be liquidated. Indian autocracy might come out alive with a few broken ribs.

What changes in the correlation of forces are necessary during the historical development dividing the prologue from the drama that is to occur? Imperialism during this period will come into still sharper conflict with the demands of historic development. The bourgeoisie will become economically more powerful. Its power rests on a higher concentration of industry and an increased predominance of foreign capital. Impressed by increasing revolutionary upsurge, the bourgeoisie will become more conservative and suspicious. The relative weight of the petty and middle bourgeoisie, insignificant before will fall still lower. The democratic intelligentsia generally speaking will have no firm social support whatever. It can have a transitional political influence but can play no independent role. Its dependence upon bourgeois liberalism will grow enormously. In these circumstances, only the youthful proletariat could give the peasantry a program, a banner and leadership. The gigantic tasks thus presented to the proletariat give rise to an urgent necessity for a special revolutionary organization capable of quickly getting hold of the popular masses and making them ready for revolutionary action under the leadership of the workers. Thus the Soviets develop gigantically. It will be the product of combined development rather than of 'historic privilege of backwardness'. No other organization could possibly arise.

The next serial revolution will still have as its immediate task the overthrow of the remnants of imperialism and Indian autocracy (Indian States). The decisive force now will be a new class formed on the basis of a concentrated industry, armed with new organizations, new methods of struggle. The law of combined development here emerges in its extreme expression. Starting with the overthrow of imperialism, of a decayed mediaeval structure, the revolution in the course of a few months will place the proletariat and the communist party in power.

In its initial task the Indian revolution will be a democratic revolution. It poses the problem of political democracy in a new way.

In the middle of the seventeenth century the bourgeois revolution in England developed under the guise of a religious reformation. A struggle for the right to pray according to one's own prayer book was identified with the struggle against the king, the aristocracy the princes of the church, and Rome. The Presbyterians and Puritans were deeply convinced that they were placing their earthly interests under the unshakable protection of the divine Providence. The goals for which the new classes were struggling commingled inseparably in their consciousness with texts from the Bible and the forms of churchy ritual. Emigrants carried with them across the ocean this tradition scaled with blood.

In France which stepped across the reformation, the Catholic church survived as a state institution until the revolution, which found its expression and justification for the tasks of the bourgeois society, not in texts from the Bible, but in the abstractions of democracy. The old society exploited with these formulas of democracy.

Each of the great revolutions marked off a new stage of the bourgeois society, and new forms of consciousness for its classes. France stepped over the reformation. Russia stepped over formal democracy. The Russian revolutionary party which was to place its stamp upon a whole epoch, sought an expression for the tasks of the revolution neither in the Bible, nor in that secularized Christianity called "pure" democracy, but in the material relations of the social classes. The Soviet system gave to these relations their simplest, most undisguised and transparent expression. This is the road to which India is whipped by the law of combined development.¹⁰

The law of combined development of backward countries - in the sense of a peculiar mixture of backward elements with the most modern factors - here rises before us in its most finished form and offers a key to the

fundamental riddle of the Indian revolution. If the agrarian problem as a heritage from the barbarism of the old Indian history, had been solved by the bourgeoisie, if it could have been solved by them, the Indian proletariat cannot possibly come to power in future. In order to realize the Soviet State, there was required a drawing together and mutual penetration of two factors belonging to completely different historic species : a peasant war - that is, a movement characteristic of the dawn of bourgeois development and a proletarian insurrection, the movement signaling its decline. This is the essence of the first Indian revolution.¹¹

It might be contended : "A government of the working class inevitably means a transition to socialism but economically and culturally India is not ripe for this. We must carry through the democratic revolution." To this, one can answer : "Societies are not so rational in building that the dates for proletarian dictatorships arrive exactly at that moment when the economic and cultural conditions are ripe for socialism. If humanity evolved as systematically as that, there would be no need for dictatorship, nor indeed for revolutions in general. Living historic societies are inharmonious through and through, and the more so the more delayed their development. The fact that in a backward country like India the bourgeoisie has decayed before the complete victory of the bourgeois regime; and that there is no body but the proletariat to replace it in the position of national leadership, is an expression of this inharmony. The economic backwardness of India does not relieve the working class of the obligation to fulfil its allotted task but merely surrounds this task with extraordinary difficulties." It must be remembered that to Rykov, who kept repeating that socialism must come from countries with a more developed industry, Lenin gave a simple but sufficient answer "you cannot say who will begin and who finish."¹²

"If to create socialism requires a definite level of culture (though no one can tell us what exactly is that definite 'level of culture') why can we

not begin first of all with the conquest of revolutionary means of the preliminary conditions for that definite level, and later, on the foundation already of a workers' and peasants' government and the Soviet system, move forward to catch up the other people's?"

Developing this thought, Lenin writes,

"To build up socialism, you say requires civilization. Very good. Then why could you not begin by creating such premises of civilization at home as the expulsion of the landlords and the driving out of the Indian capitalists, in order to begin the movement to socialism afterwards."¹³

References and Notes :

1. Vico and his most recent followers.
2. L. Trotsky, "The History of the Russian Revolution" translated by Max Eastman, 1932, 3 Vols. Vol. I, pp. 4-6.
3. It is British rule that created and legalized most Indian States.
4. Trotsky, op. cit., Vol. I, Appendix-I, pp. 463-470.
5. Vera Anstey, "Economic Development of India" 1929, pp. 438-441. (See the General Discussion).
6. Anstey, op. cit., pp. 130-143.
7. Anstey, op. cit., p. 115. "Plantation industries have been mostly established by Europeans and with European capital." p. 209, "Europeans provide the bulk of capital". See p. 286 also.
8. Gandhi may be a partial exception. But he is a great misleader. Yet he is a transitional layer between the Bourgeoisie and the Masses.
9. All India Report for Factories for 1928. See Indian Year Book 1930, p. 517.
10. Trotsky, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 6-15.
11. Trotsky, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 50-51.
12. Trotsky, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 320-321.
13. Quoted in V. Molotov, "The New Phase in the Soviet Union" p. 55.

**SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL
GUARANTEES**

SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL GUARANTEES

“Social-psychological guarantee” is a study of one of the aspects of limitations upon ‘Dictatorship’. Dictatorship, (as I have already discussed) arises out of the necessity to satisfy the needs of the hungering masses, to exploit the exploiters and to liquidate the old social order. The moment it fails to satisfy these needs socially and psychologically, that moment it falls.

What is this social-psychological guarantee? What do these words ‘social’ and ‘psychological’ connote? I think it was Jellineck who set this phrase current in Germany.¹ In America it is made current by Dean Pound.² This word is largely used in connection with the enforcement of law. Law cannot be enforced effectively, that is, it is inoperative, if it does not exact obedience from the Society, the State and the individual. It exacts obedience only when they enact norms that are equated by clashing interests. This equation involves the ‘principle of the least sacrifice’ in terms of common interests. Law is an equilibrium of social solidarity.³ By obeying the law, society is giving certain guarantees for its own re-creation and development of personality. The Individual, likewise, is guaranteed certain minimum conditions for the satisfaction of his needs, by the State and Society. Society enacts, executes and obeys its own norms through the means of State. It guarantees the conditions necessary for its existence. It can do only when norms are integrated by one mighty principle of ‘coorganic purpose’. Similarly any law passed by the Dictatorship of the Proletariat must guarantee the needs of the society (or social class) and thereby of the individual in order to have its existence prolonged. The

dictatorship as the name suggests, cannot pass any law it pleases, because by so doing it will be undermining its own power. Its very existence and continuation depends upon the guarantees it could give, guarantees necessary for the enrichment of social personality. The enforcement of its law depends proportionately upon the capacity to satisfy dominant needs of competing groups like society, state and individual.⁴ Guarantees are given in exchange for obedience of laws. Laws are passed not because dictatorship is irresponsible and can do anything it pleases but because they are social imperatives. Because they guarantee the satisfaction of needs and desires. Dictatorship is only an instrument through which social imperatives are made to reach for realization the various elements of the society. The needs are of various kinds. They are immediate and intense like those of hunger and sex. They are remote like those of culture and aesthetics. Their value, like the value of pleasure, depends upon their intensity, duration, certainty, proximity, productiveness, purity and extent.⁵ Laws are obeyed easily when they minister unto the immediate needs. The people can see that the laws are satisfying their needs. Because they are elementary, immediate, simple and instinctual. There is no need for expert knowledge to tell their grounds of their obedience. The mental process involved here is simple. Response is immediate because law touches the instinctual needs. This is the guarantee that it gives. Response is remote where the contents of law are not easily perceived by the people. Not because they are bad but because of their deficiency of knowledge. Here the mental process is not simple. Only experts know that the law is an objective social imperative and the people do not know it so. Even though the response is remote, the guarantee is there that it ministers unto their needs. A simple illustration clears this point. If vaccination laws are passed by the dictatorship at Simla, if people oppose it, it is not because that the law is not giving a social guarantee but because the people are ignorant. Vaccination is a social guarantee. Science tells us it

is an obvious necessity. Despite ignorance, laws do guarantee. To meet this deficiency coercion is necessary. It is socially indispensable. It takes the form of dictatorship. As needs get refined, remote, technical, so allegiance gets indifferent. To make the allegiance active, coercion is necessary.

It must not be confused that all laws are 'social-psychological' guarantees. Laws against trade unions, combination acts, laws against picketing are not social psychological guarantees. They do not command obedience. Because they are fundamentally defective. They do not satisfy the needs of the workers. It may be asked, "Do they not satisfy the needs of the Employers?" They do but in violation of the equilibrium of interests. History has abundantly proved the inefficacy of these laws. On the historical side the theory is strong. At a given moment, what is the criterion by which we can judge that laws are guaranteeing the interests of the state, society and individual? Here is the weakness of the theory. It is not so apparently helpless as it seems. The emergence of the dictatorship of the proletariat is a sufficient testimony that it has liquidated historic contradictions. The government in Russia is an instance of that kind. It has the freshness and enthusiasm of a historic truth in liquidating Tsarism. It has its spiritual foundations in that one single act. The moment it creates contradictions spread over time and space, that moment it meets the same fate like its predecessor. It makes history. In that process of history making, forces gather slowly and steadily for its own destruction. There are some laws whose effects could be noted immediately. There are some which cannot be noted so. Hence the test of validity must be spread over history.

What do the words 'social' and 'psychological' connote? The word 'social' connotes a society. The word 'psychological' connotes an individual. The state is a synthetic agent of liquidating the contradictions that arise between a society and individuals. It is an expression of 'collective

intelligence'. It is an inclusive centre of social mechanics. Men act and think and feel together. The patterns of each man's life is set within a social system. The pattern and the system vary from age to age.⁶ The state is such a variable pattern and system. Its laws create motives that induce society and individual to obey them. Because they guarantee the needs and desires of the people relative to time and place.'

It may be asked, "why do you use such a confusing word and try to stretch its meaning? The answer is simple. We have to think in a social background. To be understood we have to use a social language. We have to think, express in social terms."⁷ This is a limitation upon our thoughts.⁸ Language is both a hindrance as well as a help. Nevertheless, the meaning of meaning should be ascertained. In this sense old words have a power and potency when their effects are closely examined. Instead of reasoning upon deceptive words, let us, like Bentham, consider effects.⁹ It is for this reason that I have given my meaning, of the word 'social - psychological guarantee.

II

A social scientist believes in dictatorship.¹⁰ It is concentrated legislative despotism. It is a method by which social imperatives are made binding upon the community. It does not believe in nor invoke public opinion. So long as it gives social-psychological guarantees, it is not dependent upon public opinion.

What is the relation between public opinion and social-psychological guarantee? Of late public opinion has received a searching analysis in the hands of Limpmann.¹¹ It is a shiboleth of the 19th century which has obscured social and economic realities. Its philosophic foundations are weak. Its fallacies are many.

1. Public opinion, in the last analysis, is the opinion of one. It swells in intensity and volume as it is spread to the 'many'.

2. It is intellectual. The masses of the people do, out of inertia, habit and illiterary, not think. The intellectuals too have their thinking socially

shackled. Some men emancipate themselves from environment and their thinking has a lasting effect on others.

3. Public opinion under the existing social order is a class opinion. It is controlled by the Press which is in the hands of the few. The press makes and unmakes public opinion. It can create an anti-Indian feeling in no moment.

4. Public opinion is a rationalization of an after-event. It never exists when the need arises. The need for factory legislation, for the repeal of combination laws, for the abolition of slavery were felt by individuals like Shaftosbury, Hannah More, Wilbeforce and Francis Place. Social legislation was always passed against the so-called public opinion. By the time, public opinion tolerates existing legislation new needs arise, which are against the current public opinion. It always lags behind when the needs are great and intense and when legislation satisfies those needs ineffective opposition lulls its conscience. This lulling of conscience, this legalization, that is, this acceptance of concessions, is public opinion.

5. It follows that legislation is never dependent upon public opinion. The abolition of 'Sutie', the vaccination laws, the infamous Bengal ordinances, the veto of the Viceroy, deportations without trial, racial discriminatory laws, had not behind them public opinion. Laws, good or bad, invoke the myth of public opinion.

6. The present social order retains the important and concedes in Lenin's phrase, the unimportant. When it does so, it seeks refuge in the sanctuary of that political myth-public opinion.

Therefore it is a monstrosity to assume that public opinion is behind a legislative measure. On the other hand, the theory of 'social psychological guarantee' is simple and attractive. It works in a different environment. It recognizes emotional and intellectual factors. It legislates whenever the needs arise, no more and no less. It does not appeal to any myth. Its myth, if any, is its appeal to the satisfaction of needs in terms of community.

It does not wait till a collective opinion is formed. It is aware of economic and social realities. It has its strength and courage in the opinion of the expert. Its public opinion is the opinion of the expert. Its judge is the masses in simple instinctual terms. The whole time that is ordinarily allowed to pass between the emergence of need and legislation, dependent upon so-called public opinion, is shortened. This is the difference between public opinion and social psychological guarantee.

Its difference can be expressed in terms of psychology, as a difference in 'Cognitive' and 'Connotative feelings'. 'Cognitive' can be represented by public opinion. 'Connotative' by social psychological needs. 'Public opinion' implies that people could form sound opinions and organize their opinions into systematic social actions. While social scientists deny that, in reality, they take into account 'Connotative feelings' and give a 'Cognitive form' without in any way waiting for the rest of the people to follow that idea. Both schools accept connotative feelings. Both rationalize. The difference is that 'public opinion school' waits for a certain time, when the 'sociological school' legislates immediately. The one believes in realities, the other in myths.

III

A social scientist does not believe in public opinion as a socially necessary imperative. But he believes in mass-consciousness. He believes that the masses could be made to feel the enthusiasm of new ideas. In Russia, the masses are seeing concretely the effects of communism. He is seeing agriculture transformed overnight. He is seeing immense electrification. He is seeing projects and planning. The Youth Leagues, papers bring home by wire and radio, pictures of communist activities. He is seeing new houses, gymnasiums, and clubs. New forces are released. A new enthusiasm is generated. All this feverish activity must not be taken for an effort to create public opinion. The communists are making an account of their work. But a social scientist believes in public opinion as an ideal.

It is possible when cultural awakening of the masses is equal to that of other classes, when economic and social inequalities disappear. Even then it is a remote ideal. That is the meaning of Russia's activity. To register the pulse beat of the masses by satisfying their needs, is not to seek their conscious approval for legislative despotism.

IV

It might be objected that too much stress is laid upon efficacy of legislation. Herbert Spencer thinks it is a superstition. Dean Pound speaks of the inherent difficulties in all justice according to law.¹² He speaks of the limits of effective legal action, limits in respect of application and subject matter and social - psychological limitations upon enforcement of legal principles.¹³ This criticism does not apply to the general principles of legislation. They apply only with reference to actual minor details. The eternal price that dictatorship has to pay is vigilance. The soul of law lies in its enforcement. If the forces are strong and centralized, if there is a will to enforce law, if the laws guarantee social norms, the inherent difficulties vanish. They are not formidable in nature for dictatorship to liquidate such inherent defects. Hence legislative despotism is not a superstition. In our actual lives, we see how minutely our society is regulated. Even the capitalist cannot deny the power of legislation. When it is successful under capitalist contradictions, there need not be any despair for the success of legislation in a dictatorship of the proletariat.

V

Summing up, we note that dictatorship has two limitations. The first is its capacity to create and accord social-psychological guarantees necessary for the observance of law. The moment it fails, that moment the forces gather against it. They find expression in an individual. He would voice the discontent in spite of the suppression of dissentient opinion. The second is such a legislation, such a social order, releases new unseen forces which might alter the situation. This is a dialectic process that

communists believe. This involves disintegration. This fact of disintegration in a dialectic process whence emerges a new thesis, is a powerful limitation upon dictatorship.¹⁴

References and Notes :

1. "The operation of law is guaranteed when the motive power of its prescriptions is so re-enforced by social psychological influences, that the expectation is justified that the norms which the law enforces will be able to assert themselves as motives of conduct against the opposing individual motives."
Jellineck, *Allgemeine Staatslehre*, pp. 239-241, 302-341, 302 seq 304. quoted in Berolzheimer, 'The World's Legal Philosophies'. 1911. p 441.
2. Roscoe Pound, 'Criminal Justice in America' 1930, p. 22-23. The legal precepts obtain in action, as distinguished from their theoretical force in books, because their social psychological efficiency is guaranteed; because the authority which has prescribed them is so backed by social psychological power as to be in a position to give them effect, as motives for action, in spite of countervailing individual motives. Both traditional legal precepts and statutory rules continually fall short of what they are called upon to do, and their falling short is usually largely due to lack of social-psychological guarantee".
3. Pulszky, *Theory of Law and Civil Society*, 173. "Justice is thus the condition of social equilibrium".
4. Pound, *Criminal Justice*, p. 5-9.
Ibid, *Outline of Lectures on Jurisprudence*, 4th Edition 1928 p. 60-61.
5. J. Bentham, 'Theory of Legislation', Edited by C.K. Ogden, 1931 p. 31.
R.B. Perry, *Theory of Values*. 1926. Chap-I p. 270 et seq.
6. C. Delisk Burns, 'Modern Civilization on Trial', 1931, p. 1.
7. Henry Declaroux, 'Le langage et la pensee' 1924, Chapter 11.
Langage et Societe, pp. 47-61.
8. C.K. Ogden, I.A. Richards 'The Meaning of Meaning'. 1923 Summary - pp 382-391.
Josep Jastrow, "Effective Thing", 1931. Chap. 5, 'The building blocks of thought. pp. 65-81.
9. Bentham, op cit. p. 80 Cf p. 87.
10. The remarks that follow are with special reference to India but within certain limitations, they apply also to other countries.
11. W. Lipman, 1) 'Public Opinion' - 1922. 2) 'Phantom Public'- 1927. 3) 'A Preface to Morals'. 4) 'A Preface to Politics.
12. Pound, *Criminal Justice*. p. 36-54.
13. Ibid. *Outline of Lectures on Jurisprudence*. p. 71.
Ibid. *The Limits of Effective Legalization*.
XXII. Rep. Pa. Bar Ass'n. 221.
III. American Bar Ass'n. Journal 55.
14. I have repeatedly emphasised some ideas to make myself clear.
of Wells op. cit Vol.II P 570 "The law does not advertise its modernity. It should get out of sham Gothic buildings and sham dignity antiquated wigs and fancy dress, and demonstrate its beneficent workings in the light of day. It should associate itself with modern concepts of society and bring its problems into line with every day discussion".

NOTES



Dr. K.B.Krishna (1906-1948) was born in Intur, near Nidubrolu of Guntur District, Andhra Pradesh. He was educated at London School of Economics and Political Science and at Harvard University, U.S.A. He was awarded Ph.D. for his thesis on 'The Problem of Minorities or Communal Representation in India' in 1937. A prominent Marxist scholar and one of the pioneers who applied Marx's method as a tool of analysis to study the distinct and contradictory trends in Indian society. It is astounding to note the breadth of his knowledge and the range of subjects that he had dealt with includes Indian History, Philosophy, Economics, Politics and studies on Imperialism, Revolutions and National liberation movements.

Dr. Krishna "a brilliant scholar, committed to social advancement, a valiant fighter against imperialism and a steadfast champion of the working class" died in 1948 after languishing in the then British jails.

a publication of **Dr. K.B. KRISHNA**
Birth Centenary Celebrations Committee